AN ANSWER TO A DISCOURSE AGAINST Transubstantiation

Hic est Filius meus dilectus— Ipsum audite.
This is my beloved Son— Hear ye Him, Matth. 17. 5.

Permissu Superiorum.

LONDON,
Printed by *Henry Hills,* Printer to the King's Most Excellent Majesty, for His Household and Chapel. 1687.

Introduction.

IF public Applauſe, and popular Acclamations of your own Party, are to be believed, your Diſcourſe againſt Tranſubſtantiation *has ſufficiently ſhewed, that the Scriptures cannot clearly demonſtrate this miraculous Change; nor the perpetual belief thereof in the Chriſtian Church, illuſtrate it; and that there are all the reaſons in the World againſt it. Yet if a ſerious conſideration, and weighing of your Arguments in the Scale of Juſtice, be the Deciders of the preſent Debate, we ſhall find neither Scripture, nor belief of the Primitive Church, nor any reaſon in the World, againſt Tranſubſtantiation. And therefore in Chriſtian Duty, I think my ſelf obliged, to endeavor, after my poor manner, a diſcovery of your winning Artifices, and a removal of your plauſible Appearances; dividing this following Anſwer into two Parts. In my firſt, I'll examin, whether there be any tolerable ground for Tranſubſtantiation. And my ſecond, is deſigned to counterpoiſe (as you think) your Invincible Objections.*

PART I.

I Sub-divide my Firſt Part into five Sections, comprehending the five pretended grounds, one or more of which, you ſuppoſe the Church of *Rome* builds this Doctrin on. Firſt, The Authority of Scripture. Or Secondly, the perpetual belief of this Doctrin in the Chriſtian Church. Or Thirdly, the Authority of the Church to make, or declare an Article of Faith. Or Fourthly, the abſolute Neceſſity of ſuch a Change, for the benefit of thoſe who receive this Sacrament. Or Fifthly, to magnify the Power of the Prieſt.

SECT. I.

Whether Scripture authoriſe Tranſubſtantiation.

BEfore I begin to diſcuſs whether Scripture authoriſe Tranſubſtantiation: I think it convenient to premiſe two Reflections, upon two conſiderable Circumſtances, delivered in your Introduction.

Firſt Reflection upon the word Tranſubſtantiation.

In the very firſt entrance of your Diſcourſe, you complain *it is a hard word*; and afterwards increaſe your complaint with this unparallel'd exaggeration. *It was almoſt* 300 *years before this miſhapen Monſter of Tranſubſtantiation could be lick'd into that Form in which it is now ſetled and eſtabliſhed in the Church of Rome.* Bold Aſſertions ought to be ſupported with great Proofs: And Monſtrous Vilifications of the Divine Goodneſs expiated with more than ordinary Repentance. Heaven forbid, that our Bleſſed Saviour ſhould ever prove a miſhapen Monſter, even to thoſe who moſt oppoſe revealed Truth expreſſed in Tranſubſtantiation.

342. Page 25.

A hard word, and who can endure it; *a new word*, and who will admit it? St. *Hilary* anſwers you in this Reply to the *Arian* Heretics,

Heretics, importuning the primitive Church of Christ with the like expressions, *Say rather, if you speak wisely*, will you not wage new Wars against new Enemies; or take fresh Counsels against new Treasons; or *drink Counterpoison against venomous Infections?* Nor was St. *Athanasius*'s Interrogation of less force: *Are you offended at the newness of the Name? or affraid of the verity of the Mystery?*

St. Hil. cont. const. Aug. *Dic prius, si rectè disputas, nolo adversus nova venena novas medicamentorum comparationes.*

St. Athan. d. cum Ario coram Probo. *Nominis ne offenderis novitate, an etiam rei ipsius veritate, quæ hoc est sortita vocabulum.*

The sentiment of these two great Ornaments of the Church, is the common Practice of whole Sacred Antiquity; according to the Golden Sentence of *Vincentius Lyrinensis*, *The Church ordinarily appropriates some new term to signifie more pathetically the true Sense of Faith.* Thus did the first *Oecumenical* Council write ὁμόσιον *Consubstantial*, and the *Arians* could not digest the *hardness* of the *Word*. Thus did the *Ephesian* Prelates stile the B. Virgin, Θεοτόκον *Mother of God*, which was no softer to the *Nestorians*. And thus did the *Lateran* Bishops subscribe to Transubstantiation, and the *Berengarians* and Modern opposers of the *Roman* truth, expostulate with us for this Word, and modestly term it a Mishapen Monster.

Vincent. Lyr. in Commonit. *Ecclesia plerunque propter intelligentiæ lucem, non novum fidei sensum novæ appellationis proprietate signat.*

Nic. 1. in Sym.

Con. Ephes. anat. 1.

Conc. Later. decret. 1211. an.

Second Reflection upon the Evidence of Sense.

Here you bring in *Aristotle*, who long since hath pronounced, *There ought to be no dispute of the matter of Sense.* I beg Pardon if I am not at leisure, to digress with you towards Paganism. Neither can I think you serious, when you quote the Philosopher's determination, for the Mystery of the Lords Supper, who never professed a revealed Religion, and died many Hundred years before Christianity was Promulgated and Established. Nor do I apprehend the least danger to be overburden'd, with the heavy matter of Sense, when my way leads to the Sublime matter of Revelation.

You cannot deny, Sense, Reason, and Faith, are three various Perfections; so likewise are their Objects distinguished. The * Stagyrite never pretended Sense should reach farther than to the Accidents and Appearance of things. And Reasons employ was the contemplation of Essence, Nature, and Substance.

* Aristotle.

ſtance. How could *Ariſtotle* pronounce, the matter of Senſe was never to be diſputed, when 'twas always to be pry'd into, and regulated by Reaſon?

Yet we do not diſpute with you, the Prerogative of Senſe in the Myſtery of the Sacrament. For we ſee the outward ſhape and appearance of Bread and Wine; nor is Taſt wanting. All this is granted. Unleſs then you perplex and embroil the Queſtion, Senſe repoſes, without violation, quiet and contented in its own Objects.

Nor ought you to believe, that Reaſon can ſecurely, without Error, always determin in Natural Sciences, according to the received impreſſion, from the viſible Sign, or Object of Senſe. This Maxim is given to Novices entring the liſt of Dialecticks, and admitted by the Sect of Peripateticks. So Reaſon enlarges the greatneſs of the Sun, and aſſures us, it far exceeds in bigneſs the Terreſtrial Orb, tho' Senſe incloſe it in the ſmall circumference of a Ball.

Senſe indeed and Reaſon combining together, and following the preſcript of Logick, are the proper deciders of Philoſophical conteſtations. Senſe pleads for no more, and if the Reaſon of *Ariſtotle* ſurviv'd, it would be abundantly ſatisfi'd with this voluntary conceſſion.

If for all this you reſolve to ſeat Reaſon in the Chair of Judicature, even where Revelation intervenes, Divine Authority will eaſily reſcue Chriſtian Religion from the information of Senſe.

Gen. 8. v. 2. Reaſon following the Dictamen of outward exiſtence, told *Abraham*, what appeared were Men; Revelation corrected the miſtake, and aſſured him they were Angels. Reaſon affirmed

Luke 3. 22. what deſcended in the ſhape of a Dove, was that Innocent Creature: Revelation reformed the Judgment, and intimated it was the Holy Ghoſt. Reaſon regards the Species of Bread as inherent to the proper Subſtance: Revelation changes that Subſtance into the Body of Chriſt. *Abraham* ſaw the figure and ſhape of Men, and yet the Subſtance of Man was wanting. The Feathers in appearance exhibited a Dove; the real Subſtance was ſupply'd with the preſence of the Holy Ghoſt.

Ex nihilo nil fit. Again, it was a Maxim of Philoſophy, *what is, was from ſomething*. And this Evidence vaniſhes at the ſight of Revelation, which teaches the whole Univerſe was Created of nothing. 'Twas a Principle, There's no return *from Privation, to the*

the Habit, from Death to Life; and this perſwaſion ceaſes, acknowledging our Saviours Reſurrection.

Reaſons reluctancy proceeding from Senſes information, muſt yield to the Power of Revelation, or we muſt ceaſe to be Chriſtians. Thus *Julian* Apoſtatiſed, and derided Chriſtians that they were ſo ſtupid, to blindfold Reaſon with the bare word of a *Crede*, *you muſt Believe*. This in *St. Gregory Nazianzen* is recorded. St. *Clement* in the Second *Centurie* relates the ſame of the Greek Philoſophers, and confutes them by this Definition of Supernatural Faith: *Faith which the Greeks look upon as vain and unreaſonable, is a voluntary Anticipation, a Pious yielding, the Subſtance of things which are hop'd for, and an evidence of what is not ſeen, according to the Divine Apoſtle.* Faith is Firſt according to this Ancient Father, *a voluntary Anticipation* of Reaſon; and you wilfully Anticipate Faith by Reaſon. Secondly, Faith is *a pious Aſſent* to Divine Teſtimony; and you boldly contradict our Saviours own words. Thirdly, It is the *Subſtance of things hop'd for*; and you reply there's nothing to be hoped for of Subſtance in the Sacrament. Laſtly, Faith is *an Evidence of things not ſeen*; and you contend Reaſon evidences the contrary.

St. Greg. Orat. 3.

St. Clem. Alex. 2. Stom. Πίστις δὲ ἣν διδάσκουσι Κενὴν, καὶ βάρβαρον νομίζοντες Ἕλληνες περὶ ἧς ἐκάστοτε ὁδὸς, θεοσεβείας συγκατάθεσις, ἐλπιζομένων ὑπόστασις, πραγμάτων ἔλεγχος ἀ βλεπομένων, καὶ τὸ θεῖον ὑποστολον.

Reaſon rather with St. *Ambroſe*, who declares, *We believe Fiſher-men; we do not Believe Philoſophers.*

St. Ambr. *Super illud Pſal.* Omnia opera ejus in fide. Non creditur Philoſophis, creditur Piſcatoribus.

St. *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, conceived it *impoſſible to believe where Reaſon intermixes inquiries.*

St. Cyr. apud St. Maxim. Τὸ γὰρ βασανιζόμενον πῶς ἐπὶ πεπίστευται.

St. *Chryſoſtom* avow'd the *very letting of an*, How can it be, *is a beginning of incredulity.*

St. Chrys. in Joan. 6. Ὅτ' ἂν γὰρ ἡ ζήτησις τοῦ πῶς εἰσέλθῃ συνέρχεται καὶ ἀπιστία.

St. *Auguſtin* avers, that if we firſt demonſtrate and afterwards believe, *we become both Ignorant and Incredulous.*

St. Aug. tract. 27. in Joan. Nec cognoſcare, nec credere valemus.

And our B. Saviour adds the heavy burden of Condemnation, as we read in *St.* Mark, *Who will not Believe, ſhall be Condemned.* Mark c. 16.

This is ſufficient to ſhew, that Reaſon in matters of Religion ought to take her information, not from Senſe, but from the propoſal of God and Divine Scriptures. Now I examin;

Whether

Whether Scripture Authoriſe Tranſubſtantiation?

You ſay we pretend for this Doctrin the Authority of Scripture in thoſe words of our Saviour, *this is my Body*. So likewiſe do we pretend for the ſame Doctrin, the Authority of Scripture from the 6 Chapter of St. *John*, which you paſſing over in ſilence as inconſiderable, I ſhall endeavor to manifeſt, as of great importance.

Let us not mix confuſedly the thing which our Saviour promiſes to give, and the manner of receiving the Gift. A worthy receiving the Gift, is Spiritually by Faith. This is not conteſted. The Queſtion is, What is the thing promiſed to be given, whether the true Body of Chriſt or not?

Our Saviour gives two Promiſes, both of the ſame thing, his own Subſtance; both contained in the 51 verſe of St. *John*, the *Bread that I will give, is my Fleſh*; behold the Promiſe of himſelf, in the Sacrament: And, *which I will give for the life of the World*, intimates the Promiſe of himſelf to the Croſs. The Promiſes are diſtinguiſhed; the Subſtance is the ſame; becauſe the ſame Spirit of Truth which delivers two Promiſes, aſſures one Subſtance. What is then this Bread which Chriſt promiſed to give in the Sacrament? Chriſt anſwers it *is my Fleſh*, and that Fleſh *which he will give for the life of the World*. Was this a piece of Bread, or the true ſubſtantial Body of Chriſt?

John 6. *from the Greek.*

This is peculiarly ſeconded from our Saviours appeaſing the murmur of the *Capharnait's*, and raiſing their Incredulity to the Myſtery of his Fleſh, by preſaging the reſuſcitation of his own dead Body, *What if ye ſhall ſee the Son of Man aſcend up where he was before?*

verſ. 62.

If I ſhould now return your Senſe of the Sacrament for a reply to our B. Saviour, and ſay, we underſtand the Promiſe given of your Fleſh, to be Eaten in Figure only, not in Subſtance; would not the Reader ſtraight ſubſume, Then only the Figure of his Body aſcended into Heaven, and ſo void our B. Saviours Argument, and deſtroy the Miraculous Aſcenſion?

Another diſcontent ſucceeding among the Jews, cauſed our Saviour to inſtance once more the Power of his Divinity. *It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the Fleſh profiteth nothing.* This Spirit they were promiſed to receive in the Sacrament, and this Spirit is truly Chriſt, God and Man.

verſ. 63.

The

The Fleſh profiteth nothing, if we believe St. *Auſtin*; as Science, according to *St.* Paul, *puffeth up*: Science all alone, barren of Charity; for ſo properly, Science *puffeth up*. Add Charity to Science with the Divine Apoſtle, and then Science Flouriſhes and is Fruitful. The Body of Chriſt as a mortal and fading Creature profiteth nothing. Joyn God to Man, and the Fleſh of Chriſt profiteth exceedingly. Thus it profited on the Croſs, and profiteth in the Sacrament.

St. Aug. tract. 27. in Joan. *Accedat Spiritus ad carnem, quomodo accedit Charitas ad Scientiam & prodeſt plurimum: nam ſi caro nihil prodeſſet, verbum caro non fieret.* *St.* Paul 1. Cor. 8. *Scientia inflat.*

St. *Cyril* of *Alexandria* giving the ſame literal Expoſition, ſays, when *Chriſt called himſelf Spirit, he did not by this deny, that he was Fleſh*; and ſo concludes, that *this Spirit was Chriſt himſelf.*

St. Cyr. 6. in Joan. lib. 4. Πνεῦμα ὃ φησὶν ἑαυτὸν.

If this Spirit then be Chriſt, who Promiſed to give in the Sacrament, what he Promiſed to give for the life of the World, on the Croſs; who will queſtion that he did not perform what he promiſed? Or would promiſe what he could not effect? 'Tis dangerous to limit the Power of the Deity; 'tis impious to queſtion the Promiſe of God.

And yet alas! ſome Men are ſo enamoured with what they can feel to have ſome Subſtance in it, that Idolizing with Senſe, they are not ſenſible how Chriſt promiſed to give himſelf in the Sacrament; they queſtion the very Gift it ſelf, and endeavor to make good theſe two things,

1ſt. *That there's no neceſſity of underſtanding theſe words of our Saviour, This is my Body*, in the ſenſe of Tranſubſtantiation.

2ly. *That there is a great deal of Reaſon to underſtand them otherwiſe.* Theſe two general Arguments deſerve to be the Subject of two Chapters.

CHAP. I.

Of the neceſſity of underſtanding our Saviours Words in the Senſe of Tranſubſtantiation.

IF there be any ſuch neceſſity; you pretend it muſt be, either 1ſt. *Becauſe there are no Figurative expreſſions in Scripture, or elſe becauſe a Sacrament admits of no Figure.* 2ly. *You are willing to ſtand to the plain conceſſion of a great Number of the moſt Learned*

Writers of the Church of Rome *in this controverſie.* Theſe two main Proofs ſhall be conſidered in the following Articles.

Article 1.

Examen of your Firſt Proof.

I Know not upon what account you ſay, that if our Saviours words, can be taken in the Senſe of the Roman Catholic Aſſertion, this muſt be; either becauſe, *there are no Figures in Scripture*; or becauſe, a *Sacrament admits of no Figure.* Had any of our Authors made uſe of ſuch Reaſons, or inclined the leaſt this way, you would not have omitted ſuch Authority. But if you Write what you have not Read, for the pretended ground of Tranſubſtantiation; I'm ſure you have not Writ what you have Read, for the real underſtanding thereof. I ſhall remind you of ſome few Motives, which induce Roman Catholics to believe our Saviours words can import no leſs than the verity of Tranſubſtantiation.

FIRST MOTIVE.

The Written Law ſhadowed future Truth, and this Truth was Chriſt. So we read *Moſes* ſprinkled with Blood, the Book, and People, ſaying, *This is the Blood of the Teſtament which God hath enjoyned unto you.* The Blood of the Ancient Covenant was the Figure of the Blood of Jeſus Chriſt in the Sacrament. This appears from the words of our Saviour in the Inſtitution; *This is my Blood of the New Teſtament, which is ſhed for many.*

Exod. 24. Heb. 9. v. 20.

Luke 22.

This Miraculous concord of the Old and New Covenant: This repetition of the very ſame Phraſe, is an Evidence beyond denyal, that the former was a Symbol of the latter. And ſince you cannot underſtand the latter of Chriſts Blood ſpilt on the Croſs; Becauſe you pretend St. *Luke* ſays, his *Blood was then ſhed, which is ſhed for many*, which preceded the Crucifiction: It follows neceſſarily to be underſtood, of the true Blood of Chriſt in the Sacrament. Becauſe a Figure is not without the Reality, nor a Shadow without a true Body.

SECOND

SECOND MOTIVE.

As it is true that Jeſus took Bread, ſo are we taught, that he bleſſed it. And what he brake, and what he gave to his Diſciples, was without doubt, what he had bleſſed or conſecrated. The Queſtion is, what this was? None of the Evangeliſts ſay, that he gave Bread; they ſay Jeſus took Bread, and Jeſus aſſures, what was bleſſed, broken, and given, was his Body, ſaying, *This is my Body.* If it was then Bread, as the Evangeliſts note, *Jeſus took Bread*; and after the Divine Benediction or Conſecration became his Body, as Jeſus affirms, *this is my Body:* Then without extorting or racking of Scripture, without adding figurative Gloſſes, (and wicked is the Man who ſuperads to Scripture) the facile ſenſe of Scripture readily leads to the plain Article of Tranſubſtantiation.

THIRD MOTIVE.

The Circumſtances of our Saviour urge for the Literal Acceptation of *This is my Body.* For Jeſus ſpoke to his Apoſtles; to his deareſt Friends; preparing to bid his laſt Adieu; and then, if ever, Sincerity diſcloſes it ſelf, without difficulty, and after a facile and intelligible Method. He's Wiſdom it ſelf, and knew how to Phraſe his Thought. He's Omnipotent, and ſo can ſurmount what Human Frailty might conceive as impoſſible. He's Goodneſs it ſelf, and cannot deceive us. And therefore ſaid what it was, and what he ſaid was true.

FOURTH MOTIVE

Is the conformity of Scriptures. For if Chriſt had ever deſign'd to ſignifie, that the Euchariſtical Bread was only the Figure of his Body, it would ſurprize us what inclin'd him to make uſe of this Speech, *this is my Body*; and after ſuch a choice, to leave it barely without explanation, when he ſo carefully taught his Diſciples the true meaning of many eaſier Parables: 'Twould aſtoniſh us, finding the three Evangeliſts with St. *Paul* (who teſtifies he received the ſame Doctrin from revelation) not conſtrain'd, nor combining to joyn in expreſſion, yet to re- *St.* Paul, 1 Cor. 11.

peat all the ſame words, without the Leaſt alteration. And we read in Latin, Greek, Syriac, Arabic, all Verſions and Languages, nothing but the ſame expreſſion, and equal confirmation.

FIFTH MOTIVE.

The very ſame Interpretation of other Scriptural Paſſages, wherein are grounded the chief Articles of Chriſtian Belief, enforces the ſequel of Tranſubſtantiation.

Joan. in Evang. c. 1. Joan. 10. v. 30. Ep. 1. Joan. cap. 5.

For, I believe, adhering to Scripture as the Rule of Faith, that this Paſſage, *the word was made Fleſh*, imports a Subſtantial Union. I believe the *conſubſtantiality* of the Son with the Father, included in theſe words, *I and my Father are one.* I believe one Divine Eſſence of three diſtinct Perſons revealed, in *Theſe three are one.* Upon theſe Teſtimonies of Holy Writ *Subſtantially* underſtood, I quietly repoſe my belief of the Incarnation of our Saviour; the Son's Divinity; and of the ſole and undivided nature of the Bleſſed Trinity.

This Method is further ſecur'd by the conſent of all thoſe who are, and pretend to be true Members of Chriſt's Religion.

Now if I follow this Determination, ſo authorized, and ſo certain; if I follow this motive of my own Conviction in other like Articles, extending the ſame uncontrol'd Interpretation, to *this is my Body*, I muſt neceſſarily grant this Inference, *this is my Subſtantial Body.* Thus my Faith ſeeks to be one, as Scripture is one, and God one Truth.

As this literal Reflection is ſincere and pious; the figurative Explanation of our Saviour's Words wants no Fallacy nor Impiety. For, if I may preſume to give this ſenſe to our Saviour's Words, this is *not* my Subſtantial Body, this Preſumption ought to be ſtrongly grounded, as allowable, juſt, and in Equity to be follow'd. And if ſo, then I may lawfully give the ſame expoſition to the three alledg'd Articles. For the Scripture urges not more out of this Paſſage, *The word was made Fleſh*, the ſubſtantial connexion of the Second Perſon with Human Nature; or out of theſe words, *I and my Father are one*, the identity of the Son with the Father; or out of, *theſe Three are one*, the unity of Nature in three Divine Perſons; than out of *this is my Body*, the Subſtantial Body of Chriſt.

If

If therefore I might lawfully underſtand our Saviour's words in an empty figurative expoſition, ſaying, *this is* not *my* Subſtantial *Body*, I might rightly deduce (following the ſame interpretation) then *the word was* not ſubſtantially *made Fleſh*, and ſo deny the Myſtery of the Incarnation; *I and my Father are* not ſubſtantially *one*, and ſo profeſs Arianiſm; *Theſe three are* not ſubſtantially *one*; and ſo dividing the Divine Nature, conſtitute many Gods. Can ſuch a figurative Explanation be thought a ſincere part of the True Religion, which undermines, and utterly deſtroys the whole Fabrick of Chriſtianity? And ought not my own Motive in the moſt conſiderable Myſteries of Chriſtianity, contained in Scripture, be to me the ſame in the determination of the true Senſe of *This is my Body*?

SIXTH MOTIVE.

The true ſenſe of our Saviour's words may be gathered from the Doctrin which the Learned and Ancient Fathers maintain'd againſt incroaching Hereſie.

What if I ſhould now advance, that the Succeſſors of the Apoſtles upbraided Heretics for denying the Euchariſt to be the Fleſh of Chriſt, that Fleſh which ſuffered for us upon the Croſs; would you not look upon it as an invincible undertaking? and yet the glorious Martyr St. *Ignatius*, elected Biſhop of *Antiochia* thirty eight years after our Saviour's Paſſion, plainly delivers. *They* (certain Heretics, whoſe Names he thought convenient not to mention) *do not receive Euchariſts, or Sacrifices, becauſe they do not confeſs that the Euchariſt is the Fleſh of our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, which Fleſh ſuffered for our ſins, and which the Father raiſed again by his benignity.* Nor is it enough to ſay, theſe Heretics could not admit the Euchariſt to be a Figure, becauſe they deny'd that Chriſt had true Fleſh. This perchance is true. But it is not here the ſenſe of the Martyr, who ſays expreſly, that they *reject Euchariſts, becauſe they do not confeſs, that the Euchariſt is that Fleſh which ſuffered for our ſins.* The Fleſh which ſuffered for us, and roſe again, was it a Figure, or was it true Fleſh?

Εὐχαριστίας καὶ προσδυχῆς (or as others read, προσφορᾶς) ἀπέχονται, διὰ τὸ μὴ ὁμολογεῖν τὴν Εὐχαριστίαν σάρκα εἶναι τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὴν ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν παθοῦσαν, ἣν τῇ χρηστότητι ὁ πατὴρ ἤγειρεν. *St.* Ignat. Ep. ad Smyrnæos.

If

If I ſhould affirm that the Language of the Second Century, ſpoke after the ſame manner, and told us that they were taught the Euchariſt was not common Bread, but was the Fleſh of our Saviour made Man, and Jeſus incarnate; would you not reply it was a Roman Invention? And yet St. *Juſtin* the Martyr leaves this convincing Teſtimony. *We do not receive theſe things as common Bread, or common Drink: But as by the word of God Jeſus Chriſt our Saviour being incarnate, had both Fleſh and Blood for our Salvation: ſo are we taught that this Food, by which (chang'd* by digeſtion in our Bodies, κατὰ μεταβολὴν*) our Fleſh and Blood are nouriſh'd, Euchariſtated* [or transformed] *by the prayer of this* Divine *Word, is the Fleſh and Blood of that Incarnate Jeſus.* If for all this you ſhould reply, that the Euchariſtic Food is onely figuratively the Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt; then might the Reader likewiſe aver, Chriſt being incarnate had onely figuratively both Fleſh and Blood. For 'tis more to ſay, the bleſſed Bread is the Fleſh and Blood of Incarnate Jeſus, becauſe this Speech implies a ſubſtantial change, than to ſay, Jeſus being incarnate had both Fleſh and Blood, becauſe this Speech can ſignifie no more than a ſubſtantial Union. And to ſay leſs in either, is to diminiſh and change the Martyr's Senſe.

"Ουτως καὶ τὴν διὰ εὐχῆς λόγου τὴν παρ' αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφὴν, ἐξ ἧς αἷμα καὶ σάρκες κατὰ μεταβολὴν τρέφονται ἡμῶν, ἐκείνου τοῦ σαρκοποιηθέντος & Ιησοῦ καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ἐδιδάχθημεν εἶναι. St. Juſt. Apol. 2. in the end.

If I ſhould inſtance the Third Age was a faithful Imitator of the precedent; ſo dividing between the Divine Myſtery, and the Grace of the Myſtery, that the Body of Man received the Body and Blood of Chriſt, and the Soul was repleniſhed with the Grace of Faith, or effect of the Sacrament; would you not be ſurprized at the acknowledgment of what was given in Communion? And yet *Tertullian* furniſhes us with a ſufficient manifeſtation of this Truth; Saying, *Our Fleſh is fed with the Body and Blood of Chriſt, that our Soul may be filled with God.*

Tertull. de Reſurr. Carnis, c. 8. *Caro Corpore & Sanguine Chriſti veſcitur, ut Anima de Deo ſaginetur.*

Again, Theſe words, *Our Fleſh is fed with the Body and Blood of Chriſt*, cannot be deluded in an eating by Faith, becauſe the Body of Man is incapable of an act of Faith.

If I ſhould continue the Fathers of the Fourth Century, when the Church was beautified, and enriched with an innumerable Offspring of Pious and Learned Children; If I ſhould alledge how theſe worthy Champions of Chriſtian Purity forbid Poſterity

Poſterity to judge of the Sacrament by Taſt, and taught them the Body was given them under the Species of Bread; and as Chriſt changed Water into Wine, ſo did he Wine into his own Blood; would you not ſwear this Language was unknown in thoſe times? And yet both the Greek and Latin Church conſpire in this Doctrin. Hearken to that Grecian Prelate St. *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*, and acknowledge the plain truth of theſe words. *Do not judge the thing by Taſt, but by Faith. Under the ſpecies of Bread is given to thee the Body; and under the ſpecies of Wine is given to thee the Blood. Chriſt formerly changed Water into Wine; and is he not to be believed, changing Wine into his Blood?*

Μὴ ἀπὸ τ γεύσεως κείνης τὸ πρᾶγμα, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τ πίστεως.-- ἐν τύπῳ γὰρ ἄρτος, δίδοταί σοι τὸ σῶμα, καὶ ἐν τύπῳ οἶνος, δίδοταί σοι τὸ αἷμα.-- τὸ ὕδωρ ποτὲ εἰς οἶνον μεταβέβληκεν, καὶ οὐκ ἀξιοπιστός ἐστιν οἶνον μεταβαλὼν εἰς αἷμα. *St.* Cyr. Hier. Catech. 4. Myſtag.

Nor are theſe words of the Learned Latin Biſhop *Gaudentius* of leſs force. *Jeſus giving to his Diſciples Bread and Wine, ſaid, this is my Body: Let us believe, it is what he ſaid. Truth is incapable of Error. The Creator of all Nature, and Lord, who produces Bread from the Earth, made again of this Bread (becauſe he can, and promiſed) his proper Body; and becauſe he did make Wine of Water, of Wine he makes his Blood.* I know there are ſeveral Expreſſions and Compariſons in the Fathers, which only declare a ſpiritual change effected in the worthy Receiver. But do not the foregoing Authorities prove ſomething more, a change not in the Receiver, but in the thing received? and this can be no leſs than a ſubſtantial one. For when Catholics argue, that as Chriſt changed Water into Wine, ſo does he Bread into his Body: Proteſtants readily deny the ſequel, becauſe this would be to profeſs Tranſubſtantiation. If this reaſoning of Catholics include a ſubſtantial change of the Bread into Chriſt's Body, as you grant; how comes it to paſs, that the very ſame words, and very ſame reaſon in the Father's Writings, muſt have quite another interpretation? If the Fathers had deſign'd to have writ for Tranſubſtantiation, they could but have ſaid what they do, and you might ſtill explicate them in a ſpiritual ſenſe, or wreſted interpretation.

Gauden. Epiſ. Breſſ. Tract. 2. in Exod. *De Pane rurſus, quia & poteſt & promiſit, efficit proprium Corpus; & quia de Aqua Vinum fecit, de Vino Sanguinem facit.*

If I ſhould urge on, that I rightly profeſs the conſecrated Bread *transfigur'd* and *tranſelemented* into the Body of Chriſt; would you not exclaim, theſe are as hard and miſhapen words as that of Tranſubſtantiation? and yet many Fathers of this

fourth

fourth Age after Christ, use the same Expressions. Witness this Language of St. *Ambrose*, *As often as we receive the Sacraments, which by the Mystery of Prayer are transfigurated into Flesh and Blood*; witness this Speech of St. *Gregory Nyssene*. *I properly believe the Bread sanctified, by the word of God, to be changed into the Body of God the Word. And this is effected, the nature of what appears being transelemented, by vertue of benediction, into the Body of the word* Christ.

Lib. 4. de Fide, c. 5. *In carnem transfigurantur & Sanguinem.*

St. Greg. Nyss. Tom. 3. Orat. Cat. c. 37. Καλῶς ἂν ϗ νῦν τὸ τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἁγιαζόμενον ἄρτον εἰς σῶμα τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγου μεταποιεῖσθαι πιστεύομαι--- ταῦτα δὲ δίδωσι, τῇ τοῦ εὐλογίας δυνάμει περὶ ἐκεῖνο μεταστοιχειώσας τὴν φαινομένων τῷ φύσιν.

I close up this Motive with the decision of the Synod in *Egypt*, celebrated before the second Oecumenical Council, to both which presided St. *Cyril* of *Alexandria*. These Fathers composing a Creed, inserted these words in the end of their Introduction, *This is the Faith of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, in which the East and West agree.* Then immmediatly follows their Creed, divided into many Articles. What if their Seventh Article should decree the Flesh received in the Sacrament to be the very Flesh of Christ, which made one Person and two Natures in one Son; and not two Sons, one of God, Divine; and another of the Blessed Virgin, Human, as *Nestorius* Heretically taught; you could require nothing more for Transubstantiation. And yet these are their words, *We do not receive in the Sacrament our Saviour's Flesh, as common Flesh: God forbid. Nor again, as the Flesh of a Sanctified Man, or associated to the Word by unity of Dignity, but as the true vivificative, and proper Flesh of the Word himself; truly the Flesh of him, who for our sake was made, and called the Son of Man.*

Syn. Ægypt. Prov. Alex. Profess. Fid. Tom. 3. Conc. General. Καὶ ϗκ ὡς σάρκα κοινὴν δεχόμενοι· μὴ γένοιτο. Οὔτο μὴν ὡς ἀνδρὸς ἡγασμένης, ϗ συναφθέντος τῷ λόγῳ κατ' ἐνότητα τ ἀξίας, ἀλλ' ὡς ζωοποιὸν ἀληθῶς, ϗ ἰδίαν αὐτοῦ τοῦ λόγου. ἀλλ' ὡς ἰδίαν ἀληθῶς γενομένην τοῦ δι' ἡμᾶς ϗ ὑπὲρ ϗ ἀνθρώπου γενομένου τε ϗ χρηματίσαντος.

The Council admitting with *Nestorius* what was received to be true Flesh, defines against the Heretic (who pretended our Saviour, as he was the Son of the Virgin *Mary*, had not only a Nature, but likewise a Human Person, and so constituted two Persons in Christ) that we do not receive this as common Flesh, or the Flesh of an ordinary Person.

Secondly, The Council adds, *Nor as the Flesh of a Sanctified Man, or associated to the Word by the unity of Dignity*, which excluded

cluded that accidental Union, by which the *Neſtorians* joyned together two Perſons, that of the Son of God, and that of the Son of Man, in one Chriſt.

Thirdly, The Council declares, *they receive it as the all-vivificating, and proper Fleſh of the Word, that Word who was made and called Man,* profeſſing one Perſon in Chriſt, to whom this Human Nature properly belonged.

Now if all this were to be expounded of a Figure, what wreſting would there be of this Article? And how could the Council conclude the proper Fleſh of Chriſt was that of the Divine Word, one Perſon and two Natures, and ſpeak of neither, but of a pure Figure? The Sacrament might have been a Figure of the Paſſion, and yet two diſtinct Perſons admitted in Chriſt.

SEVENTH MOTIVE.

The Council of *Trent* declares, that becauſe Jeſus Chriſt our Redeemer, truly ſaid, that 'twas his own Body, which under the appearance of Bread he offered and gave to his Diſciples, *the Church of God was alwaies perſwaded,* that this wonderful change was operated by the converſion of the ſubſtance of Bread into the Subſtance of Chriſt's precious Body, and therefore renews the Canon of Tranſubſtantiation. Seſſ. 13. c. 4. *Ideo perſuaſum ſemper in Eccleſia Dei fuit.*

And You know, that as our Saviour commanded his Apoſtles to preach the Goſpel, ſo did he oblige the People to receive the promulgated Word, and be obedient to their Paſtors. The obligation of this obedience, will laſt to the end of the world: and conſequently in the mean time will be ſtill due, to the true Succeſſors of the Apoſtles, with whom Chriſt had promiſed to remain till the conſummation of the World. You cannot deny but the Romiſh Church has true ſucceſſion from Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and we are ſure you have left this Society of true Succeſſors.

Obedience therefore to the true Succeſſors of the Apoſtles, who have defined this Catholic verity, obliges me, in the laſt inſtance to believe, *this is my Body*, can import no leſs than the ſenſe of Tranſubſtantiation.

I think a ſlight conſideration of the foregoing motives, eaſily ſhews Catholics pretend not, as you would have them, that if

Tranſubſtantiation can be, *it muſt be, either becauſe there are no Figures in Scripture,* or *becauſe a Sacrament admits of no Figures.* You ſeem to be perſwaded of this, your ſelf, turning theſe imaginarie Reaſons againſt the Roman Catholic Aſſertion. But alaſs! they are no more againſt, than they were for Tranſubſtantiation. For our Saviour's words may be literally true, and yet many Figures admitted in Scripture. There may be given many Spiritual interpretations of the ſacred Text, and yet this paſſage, *the Word was made Fleſh*, litterally ſignifie that the ſecond Perſon of the Bleſſed Trinity was ſubſtantially Man. There are queſtionleſs in the old and new Teſtament many Figures, and neither lookt upon as a meer Figure. There may be then many Figures in Holy Writ, and *this is my Body*, not at all be concerned in theſe figurative interpretations.

Nor is your ſecond reaſon more efficacious than the former. For theſe words, *this is my Body*, literally received, are not at all prejudiced, by an outward ſign or Figure of a Sacrament. The very notion of a Sacrament in St. *Auſtin*'s opinion, ſhews part, and hides the remainder. What appears in the Sacrament of the Altar, is a ſign, an accidental ſhape, or reſemblance, and this is the object of Senſe. What is underſtood and believed, can be no leſs than what our Bleſſed Saviour warrants us of, *his own Body.* How then is the ſubſtance of the Elements not changed, becauſe the Euchariſt is a Sacrament, and a Sacrament is a Sign? A Man is an Image of God, yet a Subſtance. The Divine Son *is a Figure of his Father's Subſtance*: and who can wreſt from him the ſame Subſtance with his Eternal Father? 'Tis true, it was an *Arian* Error, the Son's an Image; therefore not God. Is your Illation ſtronger, the Euchariſt is a Sacrament or Sign, therefore it is not the Subſtance? This Error ought to correct yours. Now *this is my Body* may be taken, I think, in the ſenſe of Tranſubſtantiation, and the Euchariſt remain a Sacramental Sign, or reſemblance.

St. Aug. Apud *St.* Fulgen. & de diverſ. *Dicuntur Sacramenta quia aliud videtur, aliud intelligitur.*

St. Paul, Heb. 1. v. 3. Καρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ.

Had you foreſeen this Anſwer, I preſume you woul have ſmothered this inſtance, viz. *When he gave the Cup, he ſaid, this Cup is the New Teſtament in my Blood, where firſt the Cup is put for the Wine, and if any thing be changed, it muſt be the Cup.*

The ſpeedy quitting of the conteſted Propoſition, *this is my Body*, is a ready confeſſion that you were unable to diſcover therein couch'd any Figurative expoſition, and ſo haſten to

buſie

buſie your Reader with a Metonymy contain'd in the word *Cup*, put for *Wine*.

Had this been ſo, how eaſily could ſenſe and reaſon have unfolded, what appeared difficult? But why do I ſay, *difficult?* It is our common Language, to ask for a *Cup* or Glaſs, when we mean Drink. Nor was the Phraſe amongſt the Jews otherwiſe. This is cleared from the Triple repetition of the ſame Phraſe in *S. Paul* to the *Corinthians*, *Drink this Cup*. If this then was the proper ſpeech, and our Saviour did not ſpeak improperly, who could be ſo remote from Senſe, to gueſs, the Cup or Chalice was to be drunk? Would you not think that perſon extravagant, who hearing you ask (in a place where People were drinking Wine) for a Glaſs, ſhould apprehend you would ſwallow down the Glaſs, and ſo the Veſſel be turn'd into your Subſtance? Which muſt be true, if it be falſe, that Senſe and Reaſon without the ſupport of ſome farther aſſiſtance, could be deceived in ſo facile and uſual an expreſſion, of a *Cup* or Glaſs, put for *Wine*. If then the Holy Ghoſt had uſed in Scripture the Cup for Wine; I know not who could have refuſed ſuch a Figure. And becauſe I find no Metonymy, no Figure couch'd *in this is my Body*, I exclude all Figurative inſinuations. 1 Cor. 11.

I ſaid if the Holy Ghoſt had put the *Cup* for *Wine*. *Wine* you ſay, the Divine Spirit writes *Blood*, and ſo the *Cup* is metonymically put for the contained Drink, in the Chalice, or *Blood*. For what we read in *St.* Luke, *This Cup the New Teſtament in my Blood*, is equivalent to, this *Blood*, and ſo the *Cup* is *Blood*. If you ſuſpect the ſuppoſal, harken how St. *Matthew* Phraſes it, *This is my Blood of the New Teſtament*; which is repeated by St. *Mark*, and who dare contradict two Divine Teſtimonies? St. Luke 22. Matth. 26. Mark 14.

If the Spirit of God was careful to plain ſo ſmall a Nicety, in ſo familiar a Phraſe, is it credible that he would have omitted, the moſt important in the World? which he has done, if *this is my Body* be but a Figure of his Body, ſince the Scripture diſcovers nothing to diminiſh the reality of Chriſt's true Body.

What you add, if *any thing be chang'd, it is the Cup into the Covenant*, is very ſtrange. Till you make this good by Reaſon, or evince it from Scripture, give me leave not to credit your Authority. And if you think the word Teſtament, in this paſſage *this Cup or Blood is the New Teſtament*, excludes real Blood, St. *Paul* proves quite the contrary, demonſtrating, if there be Ad Heb. c. 9. v. 18.

a Teſtament, there muſt be true Blood, and ſo concludes, *Whereupon neither the firſt Teſtament, was dedicated without Blood, and without ſheding of Blood is no remiſſion.*

Laſtly, You urge, *beſides his Blood which is ſaid to be ſhed, which was not till his Paſſion, which followed the Inſtitution and firſt Celebration of this Sacrament.*

We do not diſpute with you the actual effuſion of Chriſt's natural Blood, which was a ſanguinary Sacrifice. But can you deny that in thoſe words you alledge from St. *Luke*, where Chriſt's Blood is ſaid to be ſhed, is contained a myſtical Sacrifice? St. *Auſtin* calls this, *the Oblation of Chriſt's Body on the Altar*: St. *Cyprian* four times in the ſame Epiſtle, the *Dominical Sacrifice*: St. *Gregorie Nazianzen, the unbloody Sacrifice.* Two Sacrifices we acknowledge with the holy Fathers, different in manner, not diſtinct in ſubſtance. The ſame Blood ſpilt naturally once upon the Croſs, and myſtically offered daily on the Altar. Becauſe the ſame Caracteriſtical mark of true Blood is attributed to both the Sacrifices. (*Viz.*) the remiſſion of Sins by effuſion of Blood. Hence St. *Matthew* ſpeaking of Chriſt's Blood in the Sacrament, ſays, that it *is ſhed for many for remiſſion of ſins.* And St. *Paul* in the foregoing lines, without *ſheding of Blood is no remiſſion.*

St. Aug. Civit. Dei, l. 17. c. 10. *St.* Cyp. l. 2. Ep. 3. ad Cæci. *St.* Greg. Or. 3. adverſ. Julian. ἀναιμάκτους θυσίας.

Article II.

Examen of your Second Proof.

YOU are willing to ſtand in the ſecond inſtance, to the plain conceſſion of many learned Roman Catholic Writers, concerning the neceſſity of underſtanding our Saviour's words in the ſenſe of Tranſubſtantiation. And becauſe you begin with the conceſſion of the acute Schoolman, let us examin what was the opinion of *Scotus.*

Scotus diſtinguiſhing two ſorts or Claſſes of People, the worthy and unworthy Receivers, thus delivers himſelf. *It is undoubtedly to be held, the Good not only Sacramentally, but alſo Spiritually receive; the Bad, only Sacramentally*; that is, ſubjoyns *Scotus, under the viſible ſpecies, the Fleſh of Chriſt, that Fleſh which was born of the Virgin Mary; they*

Indubitanter tenendum eſt à bonis ſumi, non modo Sacramentaliter, ſed & Spiritualiter. A malis verò tantùm Sacramentaliter, id eſt, ſub Sacramento, ſcilicet, ſub viſibili ſpecie, Chriſti carnem de Virgine

they do not myſtically receive the benefit of the Sacrament. This he proves from St. *Gregorie* the Great's determination, *the true Fleſh and true Body of Chriſt is received by Sinners and unworthy Communicants, in eſſence not in benefit.* Then *Scotus* quotes St. *Auſtin* for the ſame evidence, and concludes with the teſtimony of St. *Paul*, to the ſame purpoſe.

ſumptam & Sanguinem pro nobis fuſum ſumi: ſed non myſticam, quæ tantùm bonorum eſt. Scot. l. 4. d. 9. q. 1. B.

St. Greg. Mag. apud. Scot. *Eſt quidem indignè ſumentibus vera Chriſti caro, & verus Sanguis, ſed eſſentiâ, non ſalubri efficaciâ.*

This acute Schoolman asking afterwards (*q.* 3.) whether the Bread be changed into the Body of Chriſt: Anſwers, (*num.* 13.) that it is changed into the Body of Chriſt. *Convertitur in Corpus Chriſt.*

'Tis true, he brings in one objecting (*n.* 4. *&* *n.* 7.) that our Saviour's Words may receive a more facile Senſe than that of Tranſubſtantiation.

And *Scotus* replies, *the more difficile ſenſe is not to be admitted, if it be not true; but if it be true, and can be proved evidently to be ſo, then the more difficile ought to be choſen; and this is the caſe of the preſent Article.* N. 15. *Non eſt aliquis articulus arctandus ad intellectum difficilem, niſi ille intellectus ſit verus; ſed ſi verus eſt, & probatur evidenter eſſe verum, oportet ſecundùm illum intellectum tenere Articulum--- Sic autem ſupponitur de intellectu hujus Articuli.*

He puſhes on the reſumpt. But why did the Church prefer the more difficile ſenſe, when ſhe might have choſen a more facile in appearance?

I anſwer, ſays *Scotus, the Scriptures are expounded by the ſame Spirit, by which they were dictated; and 'tis to be ſuppoſed, the Catholic Church expounded them by the ſame Spirit, by which truth is delivered, taught by the Spirit of truth, for it was not in the power of the Church to make that true, but in the power of God the inſtitutor.*

Ab eo Spiritu expoſitæ ſunt Scripturæ, à quo conditæ ſunt. Non enim in poteſtate Eccleſiæ fuit, facere illud verum vel non verum, ſed Dei inſtituentis, ſed illum à Deo traditum Eccleſia explicavit, directa in hoc, ut creditur Spiritu veritatis, l. 4. d. 11. q. 3. n. 15.

Now what is this to your purpoſe? For if you take the conceſſion of *Scotus*, you muſt profeſs both the real Preſence and Tranſubſtantiation.

And this neceſſarily deduc'd from Scripture. Becauſe the Scripture efficaciouſly moved the Church to declare for the ſame Doctrin, according to *Scotus*'s words; *it was not in the power of the Church, to make that true or not true.* The Church then neceſſarily followed Scriptural evidence. And what was neceſſarily compulſive to the Church, was not otherwiſe to

Scotus,

Scotus, who tacitly intimated the cogent neceſſity of Scriptures Authority, for the real change of the ſubſtance of Bread into the Body of Chriſt, inſtancing it was determined by the Church for Tranſubſtantiation.

Bellarmin was of Opinion, that according to the two literal ſenſes of *this is my Body* read in the acute School-man, the ſole evidence of Scripture, could not in *Scotus*'s mind, abſtracting from the declaration and univerſal practice of the Church, evidently compel the admittance of Tranſubſtantiation.

Bellarminus, l. 3. c. 23. *Tertio addit (ſcil.* Scotus) *quia Eccleſia Catholica in generali concilio Scripturam declaravit, ex Scriptura ſic declarata, manifeſte probari Tranſubſtantiationem.*

Bellarmin was ſevere enough upon *Scotus*. Yet he diminiſhed much this ſeverity, ſaying, *the acute Schoolman added, (becauſe the Catholic Church has declared in a general Council, the true meaning of Scripture) Tranſubſtantiation may manifeſtly be proved from Scripture ſo declared.* But of what mind *Scotus* was, the foregoing Page will ſufficiently remind the unprejudic'd Reader.

Nor can you conclude *Bellarmin* himſelf, granted evidence of Scripture was wanting for the Roman Cauſe, becauſe he ſaid *Scotus*'s aſſertion *was not altogether improbable.* In like manner you may argue, againſt the ſtrongeſt Demonſtration in nature. You may frankly concede an acute Objection, not altogether improbable, and notwithſtanding this Conceſſion, ſtick faſt to the former Evidence of your Demonſtration. This is *Bellarmin*'s caſe, as the following words out of the ſame place teſtifie.

Etiamſi Scriptura, quam nos ſupra adduximus, videtur nobis tam clara, ut poſſit urgere hominem non protervum; tamen an ita ſit, meritò dubitari poteſt, cum homines acutiſſimi, qualis Scotus, *contrarium ſentiant.* Lib. 3. c. 23. de Euch.

For although, adds *Bellarmin*, *Scripture, which we have heretofore alledged, may ſeem ſo clear to us that it can compel a moderate man*, ther's evidence of Scripture for Tranſubſtantiation, and *Bellarmin*'s opinion; *Yet the acuteneſs of bright underſtandings leaves ſome doubt:* This is what is not altogether improbable.

But we ought to reflect, theſe words of *Bellarmin*, *not altogether Improbable*, are grounded upon a meer ſuppoſal of two literal Senſes, which touches not our Controverſie. For *Bellarmin* plainly denies, a figurative Expoſition probable of our Saviours words, ſpeaking of things as they are inſtituted. For thus he argues, *Theſe words, this is my Body, neceſſarily infer, either the true change of Bread as Catholics believe; or a metaphorical mutation, as Calviniſts contend.*

L. 3. c. 19. *Hæc verba neceſſariò inferunt, aut veram mutationem panis, ut volunt Catholici, aut mu-*

tend. This Calviniſtical Senſe he had already, declared as improbable, ſaying, *we will generally demonſtrate that 'tis not probable our Saviour would figuratively ſpeak.* And for the Lutherans Error holding both ſubſtance of Bread and the Body together in the Sacrament, he ſays it *ſhares not in the ſenſe of our Saviour's words.* Thus the true change of Bread into the Body of Chriſt naturally follows according to *Bellarmin*, from the plain and evident Text of Scripture.

tationem Metaphoricam, ut volunt Calviniſtæ.

L. 1. c. 9. *In univerſim demonſtrabimus, non eſſe probabile, Dominum figura te loqui voluiſſe.*

L. 3. c. 19. *Nullo modo Lutheranorum Sententiam admittunt.*

Durandus divides the ſubſtance of Bread into Matter and Form. Then adds, the Bread is converted by conſeration into the Body of our Lord; and the Form periſhing, the Matter is animated with the Soul of Chriſt. A ſtrange manner of Explication. But what doth this avail your cauſe? For if the Form of Bread periſhes in *Durandus*'s explication, and the Matter be animated with the Soul of Chriſt, the remaining Accidents can neither claim Matter nor Form of Bread, and ſo the whole Subſtance of Bread is wanting.

Duran. 4 d. 11. q. 3.

But *Durandus* calls your Sentiment, holding Bread remains after Conſecration, *the Doctrin of profane Novelty.*

De Corp. & Sang. Domini. *Profanæ novitatis dogma.*

Suarez and *Vaſquez*, treat *Durandus*, as one Divine doth anothers Opinion. But you might have well omitted their names, for one that is moderately learn'd in Divinity, knows how copiouſly they both ſhew from Scripture and Fathers, the Roman Catholic Doctrin.

Occham. You have not faithfully delivered this Divine's Authority, who thus anſwers to the ſecond Query. *I ſay that in the Sacrament is true Tranſubſtantiation.*

In. 4. Sent. q. 6. *Dico quod in Altari eſt vera Tranſubſtantiatio.*

Then he delivers four manners of underſtanding this Tranſubſtantiation. 1. That the Bread may remain with the Body. 2. That the Subſtance of the Bread may ſuddenly be removed away. 3. That it may return to Matter the common ſubject of all, or receive ſome other Form. 4. That it may be reduced to nothing. He admits all four as poſſible. The firſt manner he prefers in theſe words, which are your Objection, *The firſt manner may be held, becauſe it is neither repugnant to Reaſon, nor to Scripture, and is more reaſonable, and eaſier than the other*

Occham. Ibidem. *Primus Modus poteſt teneri, quia non repugnat rationi, nec alicui Authoritati*

(three)

Bibliæ, & eſt rationabilior, & facilior ad tenendum inter omnes modos ———

——— *Quia tamen determinatio Eccleſiæ in contrarium exiſtit, ſicut patet extra de ſumm.* Trin. de Fid.

Et communiter omnes Doctores ten nt quod ibi non remanet ſubſtantia panis, ideo etiam teneo quod non remanet ibi ſubſtantia panis, ſed illa ſpecies, & quod illi coëxiſtat Corpus Chriſti.

(three) *manners.* Theſe are Scholaſtic Opinions. And therefore this Divine leaving them, adheres to the true ſenſe of Tranſubſtantiation in theſe following words; *Yet becauſe we find extant the Churches determination contrary to this expoſition, and all Doctors univerſally hold that the ſubſtance of Bread remains not there,* (in the Sacrament;) *Therefore I alſo hold, that the ſubſtance of Bread remains not, but the ſpecies of Bread, and with this* outward ſhape of Bread *coexiſtent the Body of Chriſt.* Will you acknowledge what this Divine holds and profeſſes?

Biel in Canon Miſſæ, Lect. 40. *Quamvis expreſſe tradatur in Scriptura quod Chriſti Corpus ſub ſpeciebus panis continetur, tamen quomodo ibi ſit Chriſti Corpus, an per converſionem alicujus in ipſum, aut ſine converſione incipiat eſſe Corpus Chriſti cum pane, manentibus ſubſtantia & accidentia panis, non invenitur expreſſum in Canone Bibliæ.*

Gabriel Biel. You have corrupted *Biel.* Theſe are his words; *Although it be expreſly delivered in Scripture that the Body of Chriſt is truly contain'd under the ſpecies of Bread, yet we find not expreſs in the Canon of the Scripture, how the Body of Chriſt is there, whether by converſion of ſome thing into himſelf, or whether without converſion, the Body begins to be with the Bread, the ſubſtance and accidents of Bread remaining.*

This Author is ſo far from ſpeaking, what you force him to ſay, *as to any thing expreſſed in Scripture, a man may believe that the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine doth remain after conſecration*; that he proves we ought to believe the contrary ſenſe contained in Scripture. And this upon two accounts.

1. Although the manner of Chriſt's exiſtence in the Sacrament, be not in this Divine's opinion, evidently couch'd, yet it is ſufficiently particularized, in the Canon of the Scripture. For if *this* which was Bread, *is Chriſt's* Body, according to our Saviour's words *this is my Body*, and Chriſt's true Body be there expreſly delivered in Scripture, as *Biel* affirms, it neceſſarily follows, that the Subſtance of Bread is changed. For how can *this* (which was Bread) be Chriſt's true Body, and not loſe its own ſubſtance?

2. He expounds the Scripture after this ſame manner from the Lateran Council, St. *Auſtin*, St. *Ambroſe*, and then concludes, *From theſe and many other authorities of Saints, 'tis held that the Body of Chriſt is in the Sacrament by Tranſubſtantiation of the*

Ibidem. *Ex his & aliis plurimis Authoritatibus Sanctorum habetur, quod Corpus Chriſti eſt in Sacra-*

the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Chriſt. Does this favour the Proteſtants?

mento, per Tranſubſtantiationem ſubſtantiæ panis & vini in Corpus & Sanguinem Chriſti.

You named, but expreſſed not *Melchior Canus's* authority, who ſays, *the Body and Blood of Chriſt was offered in the Sacrifice*, and his proof is *the evident Teſtimony of St.* Luke. This I think prejudices us not in the leaſt.

Mel. Canus de locis Com. l. 12. c. 13.

Extat apud Lucam Scriptum apertiſſimum Teſtimonium ad hujus rei Probationem.

Petrus Ab Alliaco. You have miſrepreſented *Ab Alliaco*, who diſputing upon meer poſſibilities, propoſes (among others) two Queſtions. Firſt, Whether it is not poſſible that the Body of Chriſt may remain united to the ſubſtance of Bread in the Sacrament. Secondly, Whether the ſubſtance of Bread may not be ſuddenly removed away by divine power, the accidents only remaining with Chriſt's Body. This Divine thinks neither impoſſible, and prefers the firſt as more rational and conformable to Scriptures. Theſe are his words. *'Tis poſſible the Body of Chriſt may aſſume the ſubſtance of Bread, and this manner is not repugnant to reaſon, or to the authority of Scripture; it is more eaſie and more rational than that manner, which pretends the ſubſtance of Bread leaves the accidents.* Now for the ſecond. *It is not impoſſible to God, that the ſubſtance of Bread may be ſuddenly elſewhere convey'd, the ſpecies remaining in the place coexiſtent to the Body of Chriſt; this manner would not be ſo rational as the firſt.* All this is upon poſſibilities.

Petrus ab Al. 4. Sent. q. 6. *Poſſibile eſt Corpus Chriſti aſſumere ſubſtantiam panis, nec repugnat rationi, nec authoritati Bibliæ; imò eſt facilior ad intelligendum, & rationabilior, quàm ille modus, qui ponit quod ſubſtantia deſerat accidentia.*

Non eſt impoſſibile Deo, quod ſubſtantia panis ſubitò ſit alibi, remanentibus ſpeciebus in eodem loco, & eis coexiſtere Corpus Chriſti. Ille tamen modus non eſſet ita rationabilis, ſicut prius.

But not to enlarge in Scholaſtic Opinions, when matters of Faith are debated, Cannot I diſpute of what is poſſible, but you will neceſſarily deduce I deny the being of what is actually preſent? If I ſhould ſay, 'tis poſſible God may create another World, and People it with another Generation of Creatures; can you deduce from this, that there is no neceſſity of admitting any Men aliye at this preſent in the whole Univerſe?

Cajetan, 'Tis true writ, the Scripture did not evidently enforce the Roman Catholic Tenet. Great Wits ſpeak ſometimes without conſideration. Yet the Good Cardinal retracted afterwards his Error in theſe words. *We can prove Chriſt's real preſence*

Cajet. in 4. d. 29. a. 2. *In Cœna Domini.*

preſence from the words of the Goſpel. And thus in ſome manner amended, as *Soto* remarks, what was before amiſs.

You inſtance the words you object out of *Cajetan*, in the Roman Edition, *are expunged by order of Pope* Pius *V.* I Anſwer, a worthy remark to demonſtrate the vigilancy of the Roman See was not wanting to blot out Innovation in its very firſt riſe and appearance.

Cont. cap. Baby. c. 10. N. 2.

Biſhop *Fiſher*, that glorious Martyr of the Church of *Rome*, confeſſeth, *we cannot prove from the bare words of Scripture, that Prieſts conſecrate the true Body and Blood of Chriſt.*

I ſhall not diſpute whether this concern our preſent Controverſie or not; but I'le beg you'll take the following Explication of the Pious Biſhop; that is, continues the holy Martyr in the ſame place, *not becauſe this thing is now doubtful, but becauſe the certainty of this Doctrin cannot be gathered ſo ſtrongly from the bare words of the Goſpel, as from the Father's Interpretation, together with the continued practice of ſo long a time ſurviving in ſucceeding Poſterity.*

Non quod res hæc jam ambigua ſit, ſed quod ejus certitudo, non tàm habeatur ex Evangelii verbis, quàm Patrum Interpretatione, ſimul & uſu tanti temporis, quem illi poſteris reliquerunt.

The bleſſed Biſhop gives us this reaſon, why he provoked to the Fathers, *leſt any one ſhould* (ſays he) *pertinaciouſly adhere to the pure words of Scripture, deſpiſing Fathers Authorities, as* Luther *did.*

Cap. 4. de cap. Babyl. Adu. Oecolamp.

If this will not ſuffice, I'le tranſlate, when you require it, the Fourth Chapter of this ſame Book, wherein Biſhop *Fiſher* proves the Bread changed into Chriſt's Body from the three Evangeliſts. And I'le rank your Objections collected from *Luther's* Inſtances, and *Oecolampadius's* Objections on one Page, and on the oppoſite place Biſhop *Fiſher's* Solutions to them both in vindication of the Roman Catholic Aſſertion.

I finiſh this Scholaſtic Diſceptation with this Querie, Whether you would not think it weakneſs in me diſputing for Tranſubſtantiation, to uſe in my own defence theſe words of yours, which ſomewhat favour my undertaking. *I readily acknowledge the Fathers do, and that with great reaſon, very much magnify, and frequently ſpeak of a great Sacramental Change made by the Divine Benediction.* If from hence I ſhould vigorouſly aſſert, you granted the Fathers were for the Subſtantial Change, becauſe ſince you admit a wonderful Change made by the Divine Benediction, and that the Species remain unaltered, the Change muſt be acknow-

Page 11.

acknowledged in the Subſtance of Bread and Wine; would you not condemn this weakneſs, and appeal to the other parts of your Treatiſe to manifeſt this Impoſſibility? And yet all theſe Schoolmen actually write (in thoſe very Places you mention) againſt the Sectariſts, or Roman Oppoſers. And almoſt every one of them, produce from Scripture and Fathers, more Reaſons for, than you have done Objections againſt Tranſubſtantiation. I appeal to your own Judgment conſcious of this Truth. And you know, that if you do follow their Writings, and imitate the Religion, they profeſſed and died in, you muſt declare your ſelf a Member of the Roman Catholic Church.

CHAP. II.

Whether there be any reaſon to underſtand our Saviour's words contrary to the ſenſe of Tranſubſtantiation.

YOU are ſure there are a great many Reaſons; and are not ſcant of them. Theſe may be reduced to five Heads, Parables, Similitudes, the Context of St. *Matthew*, St. *Paul* to the *Corinthians*, and the Silence of the Apoſtles at the Inſtitution. I follow this order, and examin in ſo many Articles, theſe conſiderable Reaſons againſt Tranſubſtantiation.

Article I.

Whether Parables exclude the ſenſe of Tranſubſtantiation.

'TIS a Maxim among Divines, No Efficacious Argument can be drawn from Parables. This *Calvin* acknowledges. And St. *Auſtin* goes farther, admoniſhing the *Donatiſts*, n'er to endeavour an eſtabliſhment of Dogm's from Scriptural Paſſages, *which are obſcure, or ambiguous*, or *figurative*: *which* if true, the ſenſe of Tranſubſtantiation, will not in the leaſt be prejudic'd, by your Objections from Parables. Inſ. Cal. 4. c. 17. p. 21.

St. Aug. cont. Petilian. 16. *Ne ſtabilire poſſe putent ullo dogmata iis qui ſolum vel obſcurè, vel ambiguè vel figuratè dicuntur in Scripturis.*

You firſt object this Parable of Chriſt. *I am the Door.* I anſwer the 7th verſe explicates. *I am the Door of the Sheep.* And he 6th verſe, *This Parable ſpake Jeſus unto them.* What more John 10.

 preſſing

preſſing a figurative underſtanding of this paſſage, *I am the door?* But when we read, *This is my Body*, we cannot over-ſee, *which ſhall be given for you*, which maintains the Reality.

John 15. You inſtance, Chriſt ſaid, *I am the true Vine:* I anſwer, the *Syriac* interprets, *I am the Vine of truth.* Deſcend to the 5th Verſe, and Chriſt ſays, *I am the Vine*, as, *you are the Branches:* both a full

John 6. Atteſtation of a Parable. But where Jeſus tells me, *the Bread which I will give is my Fleſh*, and that Fleſh *which I will give for the life of the World*, what more concluſive for the Catholic Interpretation?

1 Cor. 12. You urge, St. *Paul* ſays, Ye are the Body of Chriſt. I anſwer; the Apoſtle declares, Verſe 13. we are ſpiritually; *For by one Spirit we are baptized into one Body.* But where Chriſt ſaid, *my Fleſh is meat indeed*, I find added many repetitions which increaſe a confirmation of the true Subſtance.

You finiſh, They drank of the Rock which followed them, and that Rock was Chriſt.

1 Cor. 10. I anſwer, you are afraid to be juſt, excluding the word *Spiritual.* For we read, v. 3. *Our Fore-fathers all eat the ſame ſpiritual Meat*, v. 4. *and did drink all the ſame ſpiritual Drink; for they drank of that ſpiritual Rock, and that Rock was Chriſt.* What if for a threefold word, *Spiritual*, in the precedent, I find a triple evidence of the true ſubſtance of Chriſt in the Sacrament, which neceſſarily requires the ſtrictly literal and divine ſenſe of our Bleſſed Saviour's words? St. *Luke* confirms, *which is ſhed for you.* St. *Mark*, *ſhed for many.* St. *Matthew*, *for the remiſſion of ſins.*

Article II.

Whether Similitudes exclude the ſenſe of Tranſubſtantiation.

IF it be well known, as you write, *that in the Hebrew Language things are commonly ſaid to be that which they do ſignifie*; It is not leſs evident, that the four Similitudes you heap together, are not prejudicial to the Catholic Expoſition of our Saviour's words. Theſe Similitudes ſhall be delivered in ſingle Paragraphs.

Paragraph

Paragraph I.

Similitude of Pharao's *Dream.* Gen. 41. 26.

YOU object, *Joſeph*, expounding *Pharao*'s Dream to him, ſays, *The ſeven good Kine are ſeven Years.*

I anſwer: We conſider ſome things as Signs, and others as Subſtances. The Sign is reaſonably called the Thing, and yet it is not, what it repreſents; ſo the Portrait of a King, is ſaid to be the King, that is, only repreſents his Majeſty. But if we conſider a thing as a Subſtance, we cannot in common Language affirm, it to be, what it is not. So Prudence will not give us leave to ſay, a Pen is Paper, becauſe a Pen is not reckon'd among repreſentative Signs. *Joſepth* reaſonably affirm'd *the ſeven Kine are ſeven Years*, and ſo *Pharao* underſtood him that they were ſeven in Repreſentation, becauſe they both knew the diſcourſe was of Signs, as the Scripture teſtifies, ver. 13. *And Pharaoh ſaid unto Joſeph, in my Dream, behold I ſtood upon the bank of the River, and behold there came up out of the River ſeven Kine.*

Our Saviour's Expreſſion, *this is my Body*, is as far diſtant from this Example, as the real inſtitution of the Sacrament, from the Narrative of a Dream; and therefore ought not to be underſtood as the like Expreſſion. But what connexion between *Pharao*'s Dream, and the change of Bread in the Sacrament? As much as betwixt the ſame Dream and our Saviour's being Subſtantially Man. If I ſhould then argue thus, as you do, *Joſeph called the ſeven Kine, ſeven Years (which Language is uſual among the Hebrews)* that is, ſignified ſeven Years, *and ſo would any man of ſenſe underſtand the like expreſſion:* Therefore when St. *John* ſays *the Word was made Fleſh*, that is, was a Figure of a Man or Phantaſm, is ſuch a Deduction, that no Language but Hebrew can be able to make it out.

Paragraph II.

Of one who never heard of Tranſubſtantiation.

THIS Similitude is very pleaſant, as if we ſhould go to Pagans, to know what is our own Religion. However *you believe, that he that never heard of Tranſubſtantiation, would never imagine any ſuch thing to be meant by our Saviour's words.* And I believe a great Number of theſe who ſaw our Saviour himſelf, deny'd he was God. You believe the Bread only ſignifies Chriſt's Body, becauſe you will bilieve ſo; I diſtinguiſh what Chriſt diſtinguiſhed; and becauſe he ſaid, *this is my Body*, I believe it was his Body; and becauſe he commanded us to do this hereafter, for a memorial of his Death and Paſſion, we obey him. Is not this to follow Scripture?

You are ſure it would never have entred into any Man's mind, to have thought, *that our Saviour did literally hold himſelf in his hands, and give away himſelf from himſelf with his own hand.* And I am ſure, what cannot enter into Man's thought, the Divine power and Omnipotency can, and has operated.

It entred into St. *Auſtin*'s mind, explicating this Scriptural Paſſage, as he thought, in the Septuagint, ——*he was carried in his hands.* Thus to propoſe your Objection: *How could this be underſtood of Man?* for *who is carried in his own hands? a Man may be ſupported in others hands, none is the burthen of his own hands.* The Saint Anſwers: *We find not the literal ſenſe fulfilled in David, in Chriſt we acknowledge it, for Chriſt was carried in his hands, when recommending his own very Body, he ſaid, this is my Body, for he carried that Body in his hands.*

St. Aug. in Pſal. 33. Conc. 1. *Quomodo intelligitur in ipſo David ſecundùm literam non invenimus, in Chriſto autem invenimus. Ferebatur enim Chriſtus in manibus, quando commendans ipſum Corpus ſuum, ait, hoc eſt Corpus meum.*

It entred into the thought of our Bleſſed Redeemer to make uſe of the like Argument, before he gave us the Promiſe, of giving himſelf entirely in the Sacrament. For did he not in that miraculous Multiplication of five Loaves, in the ſixth Chapter of St. *John*, feeding five thouſand Perſons, give the five Loaves in ſome manner from the Loaves themſelves? *The Fragments*, ſays St. *Hilarie*, *ſucceeded to Fragments, and always broken, always deceived the*

John. 6.

St. Hill. *Fragmentis fragmenta ſuccedunt, & fallunt ſemper perfracta frangentes.*

the Breaker's hand. For the Quantity of five Loaves was given, and the like Quantity ſtill remained. Which *Rabanus* thus elegantly expreſſed, *they were multiplied by being diminiſhed.* Raban. de Sang. Dom. c. 3. *Minuendo multiplicabantur.*

This Argument of our Bleſſed Saviour, if it did not convince the Obſtinate Jews, it ought to prevail with Chriſtians, or at leaſt ſilence them from ſaying, *how can he give himſelf from himſelf.*

Paragraph III.

Similitude of the Paſſover.

YOU compare with our Saviour's words, the ancient Form of the Paſſover, uſed by the *Jews* from *Ezra*'s time, as St. *Juſtin Martyr*, tells us, *This Paſſover is our Saviour and our Refuge*; *Not that*, ſay you, *they believed the Paſcal Lamb, to be ſubſtantially changed into God, who delivered them, out of the Land of Egypt, or into the Meſſias, whom they expected.*

* *St.* Juſtin. Dial. cum Trypho p. 297. Τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν, καὶ ἡ καταφυγὴ ἡμῶν.

Strange method! and dangerous way of allegation! tending to the depreſſion of Chriſtianity. Our bleſſed Saviour and the Divine Apoſtles verify the ſincere and literal truth of the new Teſtament, as figurated, and ſymbolized in the Law, Prophets and Pſalms: and you ſcrupling this Order, Judaize with the Hebrews, and will have the Law of Grace figurative, becauſe the written Law is full of Similitudes and Repreſentations.

And ſtranger remark of yours, *that the Jews did not believe the Paſchal Lamb changed into God or the Meſſias.* How could they imagine the Lamb changed into God, when they knew, God could not receive the leaſt alteration, *I am the Lord, and not chang'd?* or into the Meſſias, when change of one thing into another ſuppoſes both their exiſtences, and the Meſſias was not yet born? The Iſraelites only then could believe the Paſſover a bare Repreſentation, to put them in mind of that Salvation, which God wrought for their Fathers in *Egypt.* Malac. 3. *Ego Dominus & non mutor.*

But if St. *Juſtin* ſay, *The Paſſover is our Saviour*, would you deſire a more plain expoſition, than the very following words, that is, *our Refuge*? Καταφύγη ἡμῶν.

And if this Speech of St. *Juſtin*, were in it ſelf ſomewhat obſcure, *This Paſſover is our Saviour*; The ſame Ceremonie delivered

vered in *Exodus* by *Moſes* varying the Phraſe of the Paſſover, is a ſure Rule for underſtanding any ſuch like Expreſſion upon this account. For there we read, *it is the Lord's Paſſover.* The Septuagint tranſlate, *It is the Paſſover to the Lord.* Nor was this Expreſſion unknown to the Hebrews, *The Paſſover to the Lord.*

Exod. 12.
Sept. Πάσχα τῷ Κυρίῳ.
פֶּסַח הוּא לַיהוָה

Paragraph IV.

Similitude of a Deed.

YOU tell us that a Deed or Writing under Hand and Seal, is the conveyance of a real Eſtate, *and truly and really to all effects and purpoſes of Law, as if the very material Houſe and Lands themſelves, could be, and were actually delivered into your hands.*

If our Cauſe were pleaded at the Bar, the Law, it ſeems, you think, would make us the loſers. But if Scriptures be the Sentence, I know not why we ſhould refuſe to acknowledge what God is pleaſed to beſtow on us. He tells us what he gives, is his *own Body*; why will you not believe him?

Corpus meum.

And to come cloſe to your Objection, Do you not by the paſſing of the Deed really and truly receive the Poſſeſſion of the Subſtantial Houſe, Lands, and Revenues in Specie? You would little value the Writing, if you did not. So likewiſe the Sacrament conveys to the Receivers, the Poſſeſſion of the Subſtantial Body and Blood of our Saviour.

Article III.

Upon the Context of St. Matthew.

YOU pretend *that it was true Wine which our Saviour drank of, and communicated.* I Anſwer, not after Conſecration. You urge our Saviour ſaid; *I will not henceforth drink of this fruit of the Vine, this was true Wine.* I Anſwer, that although we cannot collect from St. *Matthew* clearly, whether theſe laſt words of our Saviour belonged to the Conſecrated or not Conſecrated Wine, yet that clearneſs which St. *Matthew*'s ſhortneſs ſeems to want, St. *Luke* abundantly ſupplies, deſcribing the order of the Paſſover, and delivering the Inſtitution of the Sacrament. So where we read in St. *Matthew*? *I will not drink of the fruit of the Vine:*

Chap. 26.

Chap. 22.

Vine: St. *Luke* interprets, and his Interpretation is true, the fruit of the Vine before Conſecration, at the Supper of the Paſſover. *With deſire, ſays our Saviour, I have deſired to eat this Paſſover with you before I ſuffer. For I ſay unto you, I will not any more eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the Kingdom of God. And he took the Cup, and gave thanks, and ſaid, take this and divide among your ſelves, for I ſay unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the Vine, untill the Kingdom of God ſhall come.* Is not this a plain repetition of St. *Matthew*'s words? And here ended the Paſſover or Paſchal Supper. The Inſtitution of the Sacrament immediately followed while they ſate at Table, and therefore St. *Luke* continues; *And he took Bread—— likewiſe alſo the Cup after Supper, ſaying, This Cup is the New Teſtament, in my Blood, which is ſhed for you.* Here is the Euchariſtic Cup, which had nothing to do with the fruit of the Vine that was uſed before Conſecration at the Paſchal Supper.

Article IV.

The Senſe of St. Paul *to the Corinthians.* 1 Cor. 10.

THUS St. *Paul* ſpeaks of this Sacrament. *The Cup of Bleſſing which we bleſs, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Chriſt? The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Chriſt?*

Theſe words, *the Bread which we break,* ſignifie *the Sacrament.* For inſtead of them, we read in the *Acts of the Apoſtles,* according to the Syriac Verſion, *the Euchariſt.*

Now for the meaning of the word *Communion.* Some will have it to be taken for *Diſtribution.* Thus the word *Communion,* is equivalent to *doth Communicate,* and makes this Senſe; *The diſtribution of the Sacrament, doth it not communicate to us the* (true) *Body of Chriſt?* Thus if I ſtould ſay, that the diſtribution of Bread in uſual eating, is the Communion of Bread, would not any Man of Senſe underſtand this to be meant of *true Bread?*

Others, notwithſtanding this natural Expoſition, in the behalf of the Roman Catholic Aſſertion, will have the word *Communion,* to ſignifie the *Subſtance* of Bread. If it muſt ſignifie *Subſtance,* let us deal fairly, and in the place of *Communion,* ſubſtitute the word *Subſtance*; and ſo we ſhall eaſily ſee to what this *Subſtance* belongs. *The Bread which we break, is it not the* * Subſtance *of the Body of Chriſt?* * Communion.

Neither can the Church of *Rome* as well argue from the following Verſe 17. *For we being many are one Bread, and one Body*; that all Chriſtians are ſubſtantially chang'd, *firſt into Bread, and then into the Natural Body of Chriſt*, as you will have it; Becauſe we ſee no Reaſon in the World for this. And the Divine Apoſtle inſtructs us otherwiſe, declaring the preciſe and only Reaſon of this Unity; *For we are all Partakers* of the ſame Body. 'Tis Participation, not any Subſtantial Change in our ſelves makes us one in Chriſt. Nor is a preſſing Example wanting in the Apoſtle, to the ſame purpoſe; *are not they* (the Pagans) *which eat of the Sacrifices, Partakers of the Altar?*

You inſtance, the ſame Apoſtle ſpeaking of the Conſecration of the Elements, ſtill calls them *the Bread, and the Cup*, in three Verſes together.

This is Acute and Subtile. But each Witty Contrivance is not true. It is not true, St. *Paul* calls the Conſecrated Elements, *the Bread and the Wine.* We read indeed in three Verſes together, the bare word of *Bread* attributed to the Euchariſt, as often *as you eat this Bread*; and this is all we read; which may be ſaid without any prejudice to the Subſtantial Change. And this for two Reaſons, both dictated by the Holy Ghoſt. Firſt, By reaſon of the outward appearance of Bread. Secondly, Becauſe it formerly was Bread.

Acts 1. 20. The Firſt Reaſon St. *Luke* authoriſes in the *Acts*. *Behold two Men ſtood by them in white apparel.* Here the bare Name of Man is attributed to Angels, and Angels are only Men in appearance.

The Second Reaſon is deduced from two Subſtantial Con-

Exod. 7. 12. verſions. We read in *Exodus*, *They caſt down every Man his Rod, and they became Serpents, but Aaron's Rod ſwallowed up the Rods of the Magicians.* And in St. *John*, when *the Ruler of the Feaſt had taſted the Water that was Wine.* He taſted Water, and the Water was Wine; The Serpent is called a Rod, and was a Serpent: becauſe the Serpent, and the Wine, were formerly a Rod and Water.

It is then true, that the bare Name of bread may be attributed to the Euchariſt without any prejudice of the Subſtantial Change of Bread into the true Body of Chriſt.

And if it be not true that St. *Paul* ſays, the Conſecrated Elements are Bread and Wine; it is true that St. *Paul* calls the

1 Cor. 11. Conſecrated Bread Chriſt's Body. *Jeſus took Bread, and when he had*

had given thanks, brake it, and ſaid, take, eat, this is my Body, which is broken for you. So does St. *Chryſoſtom*; *What is the Bread? the Body of Chriſt.* So does St. *Ambroſe*; *This Bread is Fleſh.*

St. Chryſ. *Hic τὸ γὰρ ὅτι ὁ ἄρτος, σῶμα Χριστοῦ.*

St. Ambr. l. 2. de Fide, c. 4. *Panis hic Caro eſt.*

You reſume, *this is my Body which is broken*, cannot be literally underſtood of his Natural Body broken, becauſe *his Body was then whole and unbroken.*

I anſwer, how can you contradict our Saviour, who ſays, *this is my Body which is broken?* And if it be Chriſt's Body, 'tis his real Body: for he had no Phantaſm or imaginary Body. Nor did I ever hear that Chriſt had two real Bodies. But the ſame Body may have two different exiſtences, a Natural, and Supernatural Exiſtence. For if God can give a Natural Exiſtence to what is not, can what is, hinder God from adding a Supernatural Exiſtence?

Now theſe Words, *which is broken*, cannot be underſtood of the Natural Exiſtence of our Saviour's Body hanging on the Croſs, for there his Body was unbroken; whence that of St. *Chryſoſtom*, *we may ſee this in the Euchariſt*, and the contrary on the Croſs, *His bones ſhall not be broken.*

Ibidem. *Os ejus non conteretur.*

Nor is it hard to conceive, how the Body of Chriſt may be ſaid to be broken in the Sacrament. For as a Subſtance is ſaid to be viſible, by reaſon of the viſible accidents which environ it; Thus we commonly ſay, I ſaw a Man, and yet nor Soul, nor Subſtance of the Body, but only the ſhape and outward appearance of the Subſtance, was the object of the Eye. So likewiſe Chriſt's Body in the Sacrament, takes the denomination of *broken* from the Species of Bread, which is truly divided.

Article V.

The Silence of the Apoſtles at the Inſtitution.

YOU ought not to be ſurpriſed if the Diſciples (frequently full of Queſtions and Objections) ſhould make no difficulty of this matter, when our Saviour inſtituted the Sacrament: *not ſo much as ask our Saviour, How can theſe things be? or tell him, We ſee this to be Bread and Wine, and thy Body diſtinct from both.*

My reaſon is, becauſe when the *Jews* and the Diſciples were blamed for theſe inquiries, at the promiſe of our Saviour;

the Apoſtles (aſſiſted with Divine Grace) gave credit to our Saviour's Words. And if they believed the Promiſe, why ſhould they be diſquieted at the Inſtitution?

We read after theſe words in St. *John*, (where the Promiſe of Chriſt in the Sacrament is given, *The Bread which I will give is my Fleſh:*) This Paſſage, *the Jews therefore ſtrove amongſt themſelves, ſaying, how can this man give us his Fleſh to eat?*

This Jewiſh Oppoſition was ſeconded with the murmur of Chriſt's Diſciples, *many therefore of his Diſciples when they had heard this, ſaid, This is an hard ſaying, who can hear it?*

This murmur after all our Saviour's Arguments to ſettle the Jews in the belief of what was promiſed, ended in a plain deſertion or leaving of Jeſus, *from that time many of his Diſciples went and walked no more with him.*

Here is the reluctancy you ſought for, and the Objections you demanded in the Apoſtles. But do you think this Reſiſtance was laudable in the Jews? Do you believe this Oppoſition was commendable in the Diſciples? Or rather, to be diſturbed at our Saviour's Ordination and Aſſertion, Is it not the beginning of Incredulity? And yet for all this, you raiſe Senſe, and erect it as an Idol to the Peoples Devotions. Bewitching Senſe! whoſe Allurements intice the greateſt Integrity of Nobleſt Souls, and would win too their Thoughts, if leſs than a God interpoſed.

Hence this Speech of St. *Hilary*, that great Perſecutor of Arianiſm. *There is folly in declaring for Jeſus Chriſt, had we not received from him, this Leſſon of Truth.* Jeſus ſays the Bread *is truly Fleſh*, and the Wine *is truly Blood*; *after this Declaration ther's left no place to doubt of the verity of his Fleſh and Blood.*

L. 1. *St.* Hil. de Trin. c. 8. *De veritate Carnis & Sanguinis ejus non relictus eſt ambigendi locus, nunc & ipſius Domini profeſſione & fide noſtra, vere Caro eſt & vere Sanguis eſt.*

St. *Ambroſe* oppoſes to the reſtleſs importunity of Senſe, the prerogative of the Deity; *Leſt asking of God what we expect from man, reaſon of things, we ſhould entrench upon Divine Prerogatives. And what more unworthy than to believe men in Teſtimonies they give one of another, and to deſpiſe God in thoſe he ſpeaks of himſelf?*

St. Amb. de Abra. *Patriarcha, Quàm indignum eſt Humanis Teſtimoniis de alio credamus, Dei oraculis de ſe non credamus?*

St. Chryſ. *hîc*, Περὶ Θεοῦ διαλεγόμεθα, καὶ τὸ πῶς ἐρωτᾶς; καὶ οὐκ ἀδικεῖς, οὐκ φείδεις.

St. Chryſoſtom adds, *We ſpeak of God, and you ask how this can be? do you not tremble at the exceſs of your Temerity?*

Our

Our Bleſſed Saviour himſelf reprehended his Diſciples, following what Senſe ſuggeſted at the propoſal of the Sacrament, in theſe words, *doth this offend you?* John 6. 62.

Finally, The pious Chriſtian guides his unruly Senſe in the journey towards Heaven, by the ſteady Reyns of true Faith.

Thus the Apoſtles overcoming their own ſtubborneſs, became ſupple and obedient to God's Promiſe and Power, infinitely active beyond Human Imagination, and they all joyned in St. *Peter*'s confeſſion, *And we believe*, and are *ſure thou art Chriſt the Son of the living God.* Verſe 69.

Thus Divine Faith another time prevailed with St. *Peter* (when Senſe, Reaſon, and the fury of the Sea, contradicted) to preſs the Waves with his Feet; and hardned the watry Element, into a ſolid Paſſage. The way to Heaven is ſtill by Faith. Matth. 14.

From all which it muſt needs be very evident to any Man, who will piouſly ſearch into Truth, how little reaſon there is to underſtand our Saviour's Words otherwiſe than in the ſenſe of Tranſubſtantiation.

SECT. II.

Of the perpetual belief of this Doctrin in the Chriſtian Church.

I Have already manifeſted how the Roman Catholic Church, rightly pretends as an evidence, that the Fathers of the Primitive Ages interpreted our Saviour's Words in the ſenſe of Tranſubſtantiation. But what Authors have been ſo fortunate in their Writings, that the contrived endeavours of others, have not cull'd out ſome places, not ſo dark in themſelves, as they are ſhaded with ſmothered Repreſentations? Theſe your Induſtry, with no ſmall increaſe, has compacted together. After this great Task, you are pleaſed to ſhew, when the Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation firſt came in. And finally, you undertake to give a Solution to the pretended Demonſtration of Mr. *Arnauld* a learned man in *France*. Theſe three Subjects ſhall be the Mattter of ſo many Chapters.

CHAP.

CHAP. I.

Whether any of the Fathers are againſt Tranſubſtantiation.

REflection is the cauſe of Knowledge: Diviſion leads to Reflection. I'll therefore divide your ſelected Teſtimonies, that they may be the conſideration of ſo many diſtinct Articles.

Article I.

Upon St. Juſtin Martyr.

St. Juſtin. Apol. 2. Ἐξ ὧν αἷμα καὶ σάρκες κατ' μεταβολὴν τρέφονται ἡμῶν.

YOU begin unfortunately with St. *Juſtin*, whom you *make expreſly to ſay*, that *our blood and fleſh are nouriſhed by the converſion of that Food, which we receive in the Sacrament.*

I find no ſuch thing in the holy Martyr. 'Tis true, I read theſe words, *By which* Food (*chang'd* in our Bodies, κατ' μεταβολὴν) *our Blood and Fleſh are nouriſhed.* What then? Bread and Wine taken out of the Sacrament, nouriſh, according to this Paſſage, Fleſh and Blood, which all the World will allow of. And I ſhall believe St. *Juſtin* ſays no more, till you can prove it from the Saint's own Teſtimonie. But why do I ſay Teſtimonie, when the Paſſage you cite, is nothing but a bare Parentheſis? I could heap up a great many ſuch weakneſſes, collected out of your Diſcourſe, if the World were not already too much troubled with ſuch trivial Reflections. I'll take liberty to add one more conſiderable, *viz.* If natural digeſtion can change Bread and Wine into the proper Subſtance of our Bodies, how eaſy will it be to Nature's Author, to change one thing into another, Bread into the Body of Chriſt? Nor can any moderate Man imagin any thing leſs, when the Devil himſelf tempted Chriſt to change one Subſtance into another, Stones into Bread, as a Strategem to find out, whether he was God.

Look likewiſe into the Book of *Geneſis*, and you'll find that the ſole Word of God, gave, in the beginning of Creation, a Being to all Nature: and how much more difficult is it, to make all things of nothing, than to change one thing into another?

ther? Does not this evidence the poſſibility of Tranſubſtantiation? I thank you for this Objection.

Article II.

Upon St. Irenæus.

NOR are you more fortunate in St. *Irenæus*, who ſpeaking of the Sacrament, ſays. *The Bread which is from the Earth receiving the Divine Invocation, is now no longer common Bread, but the Euchariſt, conſiſting of two things, the one earthly, the other heavenly.* For, what is earthly, may not unfitly be called the ſpecies of Bread; and what is heavenly, Chriſt himſelf. Or what if I ſhould attribute this earthly thing to Chriſt's Humanity, and the heavenly thing to Chriſt's Divinity, the Sacrament would be rightly ſaid, *conſiſting of two things, the one earthly, the other heavenly?* I am ſure the Proper Subſtance of Bread, is nothing but Common Bread; And yet St. *Irenæus* affirms, this ceaſes after Conſecration; *receiving the Divine Invocation, 'tis no longer Common Bread,* it is not what it was before. L. 4. c. 37.

You inſtance, and elſewhere he hath this Paſſage; *when therefore the Cup that is mixt, and the Bread that is broken, receives the Word of God, it becomes the Euchariſt of the Body and Blood of Chriſt, of which the ſubſtance of our Fleſh is increaſed, and ſubſiſts.* L. 5. c. 2.

St. *Irenæus* diſcourſes not here of a natural, but of ſome ſpiritual increaſe of Fleſh and Blood. For he ſays, *our Fleſh is increaſed with the Bread,* as it becomes the Body and Blood of Chriſt, in which ſenſe preciſely, 'tis only ſupernatural Food.

Bread, as it is ſupernatural Food, or the true Body of Chriſt in the Sacrament, increaſes the Soul with Grace; and Fleſh and Blood with a Legitimacy of Immortality. Theſe two great Benefits are neatly delivered, as the proper effects of Chriſt's ſubſtantial preſence in the Sacrament, in theſe words of the *Nyſſene* Doctor; *As the dire conſequence of Poyſon is by Counterpoyſon prevented; ſo the wholſome remedy, which operates our Salvation, entring the Bowels of Man, thence every-where diffuſes its force and vivification. What is this* (wholſome) *remedy? That Body which Jeſus exhibited ſtronger than Death, and*

Catech 37. *Oportet autem ſicut exitiale, ita etiam ſalutare medicamentum admitti intra viſcera hominis, ut per illa diſtribuatur in univerſum Corpus, virtus ejus quod fert opem. Quid hoc ergo eſt? nihil aliud quam illud Corpus, quod & morte oſtenſum fuit eſſe potentius & noſtræ Vitæ fuit initium.*

which

which was the beginning of Life. What can more evince Christ's ſubſtantial Preſence, to be the productive Cauſe of Sacramental Grace, than to teſtifie, this Adorable Body, which died for us, is in ours, as a wholſome remedy, there communicating Virtue, and diſpenſing heavenly Treaſures?

So is the ſame true Body of Chriſt preſent in the Sacrament, the cauſe effective of our future Incorruption in Glory; and increaſes in this ſenſe the ſubſtance of Fleſh and Blood, with a beginning of Immortality; as appears from the following Lines of the ſame Father. *Jeſus, according to the diſpenſation of Grace, enters by Fleſh into thoſe who believe, mixing himſelf with the Body of the Faithful, that Man may become Partaker of Incorruption, by the union with this Immortal Body.*

Eâ de causâ per ſuæ Gratiæ diſpenſationem, ſe per Carnem inſerit, omnibus credentibus, commiſſus & contemperatus corporibus credentium, quibus ſubſtantia eſt ex pane & vino, ut unione cum eo quod eſt immortale, ſit etiam homo particeps incorruptionis.

This ſecond benefit in St. *Irenæus*'s mind increaſes the Subſtance of Fleſh and Blood, giving a beginning of reſurrection to the Body: Or, to uſe this Saint's Example; *As a grain of Wheat diſſolved in earth, riſes by the power of God with much increaſe; ſo Fleſh and Blood receiving in the Sacrament from the preſence of Chriſt's Immortal Body, the living Seed of Incorruption, riſe (when diſſolved by death) increaſed with Immortality.*

St. Irenæus. *Quemadmodum granum tritici decidens in terram, & diſſolutum multiplex ſurgit per Spiritum Dei, ſic & noſtra Corpora Corpore Chriſti nutrita & repoſita in terram, & reſoluta, reſurgent in ſuo tempore.*

This agrees well with St. *Irenæus*'s deſign, demonſtrating in the place objected, that our Bodies are capable of Reſurrection, becauſe we receive in the Sacrament the true Body of Chriſt, that Body which conſiſts of Fleſh, Blood and Bones. *How can they deny,* ſays he, *the Fleſh to be capable of the Gift of God? For we are Members of his Body, of his Fleſh, and of his Bones. This is not ſpoken of a Spiritual or Metaphorical Man, for a Spirit has neither Bone nor Fleſh, but it is delivered according to the diſpoſition of Man, which conſiſts of Fleſh, of Nerves, and Bones, which is nouriſhed with the Chalice, which is his Blood, and increaſed with the Bread, which is his Body.* Do not Fleſh, Nerves, Bones and Blood, belong to a true Subſtantial Body?

L. 5. c. 2. *De ea diſpoſitione quæ eſt ſecundum hominem, quæ ex Carnibus & Nervis & Oſſibus conſiſtit, quæ de Calice, qui eſt Sanguis ejus nutritur, & de Pane, qui eſt Corpus ejus, augetur.*

Apud Oecum. in 1 Per. 3. *You add St.* Irenæus's *words, preſerved by* Oecumenius, *when the Greeks had taken ſome Servants of the Chriſtian Catecumeni* (that is, ſuch

ſuch as were diſpoſed, but not yet baptized) *and afterwards urged them by violence, to tell them ſome of the ſecrets of the Chriſtians. Theſe Servants having nothing to ſay, that might gratifie thoſe who offered violence to them, except only that they had heard from their Maſters, that the Divine Communion was the Blood and Body of Chriſt; they thinking, that it was really Blood and Fleſh, declared as much to thoſe who queſtion'd them. The Greeks taking this as it really were done by the Chriſtians, diſcovered it to others of the Greeks, who hereupon put* Sanctus *and* Blandina *to the torture, to make them confeſs it. To whom* Blandina *boldly anſwered, how would they endure to do this, who by way of exerciſe (or abſtinence) do not eat that Fleſh which may lawfully be eaten?*

Now if we conſider *Blandina*'s Anſwer, we ſhall find therein contained, a pious denyal of what was objected, and a Chriſtian reſerve of what was received in the Sacrament. A pious denial of eating the Fleſh and Blood of a Child, as the Greeks (and all Pagans) conceived, after a carnal manner, which ſhall be more amply diſcourſed hereafter. And this cauſed *Blandina* to ſay, *How could they be guilty of ſuch a heinous eating? who abſtain, upon faſting days from Fleſh which may lawfully be eaten?* A Chriſtian reſerve, not diſcovering the Myſtery to Pagans, which was eſteemed a betraying of Religion.

Thus *Tharſilius* the Acholyt, as venerable *Beda* relates, having the bleſſed Sacrament about him, was ſeized on by the Barbarians, and martyr'd, becauſe he refuſed to ſhew it. V. Bede Martyr, 18. Octr.

St. *Ambroſe* declares the diſcovery of the Myſtery to thoſe who were not baptized, *paſs'd not for an inſtruction, but for a ſort of Treaſon in Religion.*

St. Amb. l. de Novis Baptiſ. c. 1. *Prodidiſſe potius quàm edidiſſe exiſtimaremur.*

St. *Cyril* ſays, *We ſpeak not clearly of the Myſtery to the Catecumeni, and we are often conſtrained, to make uſe of ſuch Expreſſions; which are underſtood by the Faithful inſtructed, and do not offend other Aſſiſtants.* Such was *Blandina*'s Reply, which neither offended the Greeks, nor betrayed the Myſtery. *St.* Cyril, Hier. Cat. 6.

Article III.

Upon Tertullian.

Adv. Marcion. l. 4. p. 57. edit. Rigal.

TErtullian proves againſt *Marcion*, as you write, the Heretique, That the Body of our Saviour, was not a meer Phantaſm and Appearance, but a real Body, *becauſe the Sacrament is a Figure, and an Image of his Body.* His Words are theſe; *The Bread which our Saviour took, and gave to his Diſciples, he made his own Body, ſaying, this is my Body, that is, the Figure of my Body. But it could not have been a Figure of his Body, if there had not been a true and real Body.*

Lact. de Divin. Inſt. l. 5. c. 1. St. Hierom. de Inſt. Mon. ad Paul. Tom. 1. *Creber in ſententiis difficilis in loquendo.*

Tertullian, *often ſententious, and difficult in expreſſion*, as *Lactantius* and St. *Jerom* affirm, may eaſily be miſunderſtood, and miſrepreſented.

This Father's deſign here, is to confute the Marcionites, who defended that the God of the Old Teſtament, was oppoſite to God the Father of Chriſt, Author of the New Law. He makes good this undertaking, proving the perfect agreement of both Teſtaments, completed in Jeſus, who did not aboliſh, but fulfil the Law, when he changed *the Shadow into a Body, the Figure into Truth*, As *Tertullian* phraſes it, in his Fifth Book againſt *Marcion.*

Jer. *Mittamus lignum in Panem ejus.*

This Accompliſhment he ſhew'd from that of *Jeremy*, where we read how the Jews faſt'ned to the Croſs the *Bread* of Chriſt, that is, his *Body.* This he evidenced, becauſe Bread in the Old Law, was a Figure of Chriſt's Body. Theſe are his Words, *It is what God has revealed in your own Goſpel, calling Bread his Body, making known by this, that Chriſt, whoſe Body the Prophet repreſented in Bread, long before he fulfilled this Figure, gave from this very time* (of the Prophecy) *Bread to be the Figure of his Body.*

Tertul. l. 3. c. 19. Contra. Marc. *Sic enim Deus in Evangelio quoque veſtro revelavit, Panem Corpus ſuum appellans, ut & hinc jam tum intelligas Corporis ſui figuram Pane dediſſe, cujus retro Corpus in Pane Prophetæ Figuravit.*

Theſe Words, *Chriſt gave the Bread*, even from the time of *Jeremy*, *to be the Figure of his Body*, repreſent Chriſt as Maſter; and theſe others, *Jeremy repreſented in Bread the Body of Chriſt*, exhibit the Prophet as Miniſter. Both teſtifie, that Bread was a Figure in the Written Law; and the Subordination of *Jeremy*

to

to *Jesus*, proves the concord of Christ with the ancient Testament, which was *Tertullian*'s peculiar Task.

The same he pursues in the place by you cited, *Bread*, (*He made his own Body, saying, this is my Body,*) that is, *a Figure* in the Prophet *of Christ's Body*. This sense agrees well with the foregoing Tenor of this learned Father's Discourse. 2. These following Words are another Confirmation, *But it would not have been a Figure of his Body, if there was not a true Body.* He does not say, *it was not a Figure*, he says, *it would not have been a Figure in the Old Law.* 3. *Marcion* argues for you, *but why did he call Bread his Body*, and not something else? *Tertullian* answers, that he argued thus, *not knowing Bread was an ancient Figure of the Body of Christ, as we learn from* Jeremy. 4. He confirms the same in these Words, *You may likewise acknowledge the Old Figure of Blood in Wine.* Lib. 4.

Lib. 4. c. 40. *Non intelligens veterem fuisse istam Figuram Corporis Christi dicentis per* Jeremiam.--- *Ut autem & Sanguinis veterem Figuram in Vino recognoscas.*

It follows also from hence, that our Saviour's Body, was not a Phantasm or an Appearance, which was another of the Marcionits Errors, but a real Body; not that the Sacrament, as you would have it, but that Bread in the Old Law, as I have demonstrated, was a Figure and Image of his Body in the Sacrament; which must be a true Body; otherwise there is a Figure of a Figure, which your own party will not allow of. *Nor could it*, adds *Tertullian*, *have been a Figure of his Body, if there had not been a true and real Body.*

If for all this you will pretend, that as Bread in the Prophet was a Figure, so likewise is Bread still in the Eucharist a Figure of Christ's Body; I may without prejudice to the Catholic Belief, humour you so far, as to grant the Sacramental Bread is a Figure, but a Figure joyned to the Reality. For if you will say, what you find not in *Tertullian*, *that the Bread in the Sacrament is a Figure of Christ's Body*, you cannot deny but you read in this Father, that Christ *made the Bread his Body*, as we read in St. *John*, *he made Water Wine.* The Sacrament may then be a Figure, and the true Body.

Thus he proves the same thing to be called a Figure, and yet to be the same substance, instancing, *the Word is God, and an Image too.* The Catholic Church only disallows those Figures, which exclude the true Substance of Christ's Body present in the Sacrament. L. 5. contra Marc. *Deus est & Effigies.*

You urge a ſecond Teſtimony from the ſame Author, uſing this Argument againſt the Sceptics, who rejected the certainty of Senſe, *He might be deceived in the voice from Heaven, in the ſmell of the Oyntment, with which he was anointed againſt his burial, and in the taſte of the Wine, which he conſecrated in the remembrance of his Blood.* Theſe laſt Words are ſomewhat changed; *Tertullian* ſays, *he taſted not another Savour of Wine which he conſecrated in remembrance of his Blood.*

L. de cap. 17.

Non alium poſtea Vini ſaporem quod conſecravit in Sanguinis ſui memoriam.

This learned Father eſtabliſhed two Principles. 1. That Chriſt was truly Man. And 2. That his Operations were real like other Mens.

The Firſt Verity, was not here *Tertullian*'s Theme. This he vindicated againſt *Marcion*, where he proved that Chriſt was not a Phantaſm, or Appearance.

The Second Verity *Tertullian* here made good, againſt the Sceptics. For if the ſound of the Voice from Heaven was not imaginary, if the Smell of the Perfume was not Odoriferous, and if there was not another Taſt of the Wine, which was conſecrated in remembrance of Chriſt's Blood; then theſe Operations of our Saviour were not diſtinct from vulgar Senſation, like thoſe Impreſſions other Men naturally receive, ſincere, real, and without deluſion. All Catholics grant as much, and none will deny the ſame Taſt of Wine after Conſecration. But the Taſt is not the Subſtance of Wine.

The Subſtance of Wine is not here ſpoken of. And the knowledge of Subſtance is the proper endeavour of Reaſon. Senſes care is to ſearch into the certainty of Colour, Taſt, Accidents and Appearances, which was *Tertullian*'s Province againſt the Sceptics.

The whole Controverſie then between us is left by this Objection entire and untouched.

Article IV.

Upon Origen.

ORigen, on his Comment on St. *Matthew*, ſpeaking of the Sacrament, hath this Paſſage; *That Food which is ſanctified by the Word of God, and Prayer, as to that of it which is material, goeth*

goeth into the Belly, and is caſt out into the Draught, which none ſurely will ſay (as you remark) *of the Body of Chriſt.*

But ſome have ſaid it of the Body of Chriſt, which they thought was conveyed under the ſhape of material Accidents of Bread into the Draught: which Senſe, if admitted to be *Origen*'s, the Learned Cardinal *Peron* might ſay without injury, Origen *talks like an Heretic.* Peron in Orig.

The ſame Illuſtrious Cardinal doubts whether this be the Work of *Origen*; becauſe he ſays, *Eraſmus* was the firſt that produced this Old Fragment; where he had it, no Body knows; and this not a Fragment, but only a Verſion thereof, and cautioned by himſelf.

Sixtus Senenſis ſuſpects this Teſtimony of *Origen* was depraved by Heretics. *Genebrard* is of the ſame Opinion. Sixtus Sen. Bib. ſ. l. 6. Geneb. Præf. in Origen.

Theſe Critical Cenſures take all aſſurance from your Objection, rendring it either dubious, or depraved, or heretical.

Moreover, if *Origen* in this Paſſage, ſhould downright preſcribe the Catholic Belief of the change of Bread into the Body of Chriſt, this ought not to diſquiet any ſober Inquirer. Becauſe his chief Error was the excluſion of the literal Senſe in Scripture. Whereupon *Lirinenſis* calls *Origen* the Interpreter of Scripture after a new manner. St. *Epiphanious* complains he turned all into Allegories. *Theophilus* ſays, *he ſupplants by Shades and Images the Truths of Scripture.* And the Church in the Fifth Oecumenical Council, peculiarly anathematiſed his Works. Lirin. in Comm. St. Epiph. Hær. 64. Theoph. l. Paſch. 1. Con. Gen. 5. Collat. 8. cap. 11.

Finally, If I ſhould anſwer, by *what is material* is underſtood only the material Accidents of Bread and Wine which go into the Belly, and are caſt into the Draught, what inconvenience would follow, from your Objection? No more, than what follows from what the ſame Father adds by way of explication, *It is not the matter of the Bread, but the Word which is ſpoken over it, which profiteth him who worthily eateth the Lord; and this* (he ſays) *he had ſpoken, concerning the Typical and Symbolical Body.* So that the Matter of Bread receives the Word of God ſpoken over it, and this Word, as it changes the Subſtance of Bread, ſo doth it profit the worthy Receiver; and this Word *Origen* calls the Typical and Symbolical Body of Chriſt, becauſe the Word is Spiritual Food. Thus the ſame Father, in his Homilies upon *Leviticus* proves Chriſt's Fleſh to be true Meat, becauſe *all his*

Homil. 7. in Levit. *Cibus eſt Petrus & Paulus & omnes Apoſtoli.*

his Speech is true Food. And he adds St. *Peter*, St. *Paul*, *and all the Apoſtles are Food*, will you conclude from hence, the Apoſtles were not true Men?

At leaſt, if this will not do, you reſolve to do the buſineſs by drawing out of the ſame Homily, *a killing Letter* of the New Teſtament. *For if*, ſays *Origen*, *we take according to the Letter, that which is ſaid, except ye eat my Fleſh, and drink my Blood, this Letter kills.*

This Letter *except ye eat my Fleſh*, (underſtood of the Subſtantial preſence of Chriſt's Body after a Sacramental manner, inviſible to Senſe, under the ſpecies of Bread,) is what gives life in the Catholic Church, according to that of St. *John*, *who ſhall eat my Fleſh, ſhall live for ever.*

John 6.

If Roman Catholics be out of danger, the blow muſt fall elſe where. It falls upon the Capharnaits, who following the naked Letter, carnally thought our Saviour would give his Fleſh to be ſerved in as common Meat, and cut in Pieces. It falls upon thoſe who literally adhering to what they ſee, believe they receive, what it ſeems to be, Bread. Upon both theſe it falls.

Levit. 7. Hom. *Si vero adſideamus literæ, & ſecundum hoc: vel quod Judæis; vel id quod vulgò videtur, accipiamus, quæ in lege ſcripta ſunt, erubeſco dicere & confiteri, quia tales Leges dederit Deus.*

If we follow, ſaith *Origen*, *the Letter, and expound it either according to the Jews acceptation* (were not theſe the Capharnaity,) *or according to what it ſeems commonly to be*, (are you not of this Number) *I bluſh to confeſs what is writ in the Law.* Thus you ſtrike at Catholics with the Killing Letter of *Origen*, and wound your ſelf together with the *Capharnaits*.

For your warlike Argument give me leave to propoſe two peaceable ones, out of the ſame Father.

Hom. 7. in Numb. *Tunc in ænigmate erat Manna Cibus, nunc autem in ſpecie Caro verbi Dei eſt verus Cibus. Quæ in ænigmate deſignabantur nunc in ſpecie & veritate compleantur.*

The Firſt is in his Homilies upon *Numbers*, where he compares the Figure with the Figurated, the Manna with the Body of Chriſt; *The Manna was in Figure Food. Now in reality the Fleſh of the Word God is true Meat. And what was firſt in the Figure deſigned, is now compleated in truth and reality.*

Homil. 5. In diverſa. *Quando illud incorruptum accipias epulum, quando vitæ pane & populo frueris,*

The Second is contained in theſe Words, *When you receive the Holy Food and Incorruptible Banquet, when in the Bread and Cup of life, you*

eat

eat and drink the Body and Blood of our Lord, then our Lord enters under your roof; do you therefore humbling your self imitate the Centurion, and say, Lord, I am not worthy thou ſhouldſt enter under my Roof, for where he enters unworthily, there he enters in Judgment with the Receiver. This holy Food cannot be the ſubſtance of Bread, becauſe *Origen* calls it *an incorruptible Banquet*; Bread is not ſuch. Nor can it be a bare typical Figure of the Lord; for when the Centurion ſaid, O Lord, *I am not worthy*, 'twas our own Saviour preſent. And if this Humiliation, *O Lord, I am unworthy*, be attributed to any thing but our Saviour there preſent, how can you excuſe it from Idolatrie? Finally, this Lord invocated, enters into the wicked, which cannot be by Faith. For your Church, teaches unworthy Receivers are not partakers of the Lord in the Sacrament by Faith.

manducas & bibis Corpus & Sanguinem Domini. Tunc Dominus ſub tectum tuum ingreditur, & tu ergo humilians teipſum, imitare hunc Centurionem, & dicito, Domine non ſum dignus, ubi enim indigne ingreditur, ibi ad Judicium ingreditur accipienti.

Article V.

Upon St. Cyprian.

YOU object St. *Cyprian* hath a whole Epiſtle to *Cæcilius* againſt thoſe who gave the Communion in Water, without Wine mingled with it; and his main Argument againſt them is this, that *the Blood of Chriſt with which we are redeemed and quickned, cannot ſeem to be in the Cup when Wine is wanting to the Chalice, by which the Blood of Chriſt is repreſented.*

Nec poteſt videri Sanguis ejus quo redempti, & vivificati, eſſe in Calice, quando Vinum deſit Calici, quo Chriſti Sanguis oſtenditur. L. 2. Ep. 3. ad Cæcilium.

Very well. It is Wine in repreſentation, and the Blood of Chriſt is in the Cup by propriety or effence; for it is that Blood *with which we were redeemed and quickned*, according to St. *Cyprian.*

You argue afterwards from theſe other Words of the ſame Saint, by the *Water the People is underſtood; by Wine the Blood of Chriſt is ſhew'n; but when in the Cup Water is mingled with Wine, the People are united to Chriſt*; ſo that you deduce, according to this Argument, Wine in the Sacramental Cup, is no otherwiſe changed into the Blood of Chriſt, than the Water mixed with it is changed into the People, which are ſaid to be united to Chriſt.

I ſhall

Jesus ostendens gentium Populum succedere in locum quem Judæi perdiderant de aqua vinum fecit.

I shall not be strictly put to it, for an Answer, after I have thus proposed St. *Cyprian*'s mind. St. *Cyprian* compares here the Jews to Wine, the Gentiles to Water, at the Marriage of Canaan. The want of Wine marked out the Jews, who refused to embrace the Law of Christ; The plentifulness of Water represented the Gentiles converted to Christianity. Hence Water comes in the Sacrament to design the Elected People, Wine the Blood of Christ, and both mixt in the Chalice, the union of the People with Christ. Now to your Argument. And that I may the better convince you, give me leave to make use of your Logic.

Water is the People as Wine is Christ; then as we receive Christ by Faith in the Sacrament, so do we the People: And consequently the People sanctify the Soul as Christ doth in the Eucharist. Are you not ashamed of your Sophism? Or rather, how durst you equalize the People with Christ, Sinners with their Saviour, Man with God?

Again, Wine signified the Jews, according to St. *Cyprian*, and Water the Gentiles; now deduce from hence, the Water was not changed into Wine at the Marriage of Canaan, as you have done from the like instance, that the mixed Chalice is not changed into Christ's Body and Blood.

Article VI.

Upon St. Augustin.

THE variety of Testimonies you gather from St. *Augustin*, cannot well without perplexity, be considered altogether. I'll endeavour to decline this Confusion, examining each one of them in so many Paragraphs.

Paragraph I.

Contra Adimant. c. 12.

YOU pitch first upon this Expression of St. *Austin*'s in his Book against *Adimantus* the Manichee, *Our Lord did not doubt to say this is my Body, when he gave the sign of his Body.*

Adimantus endeavours to demonstrate the God of the Old Testament prohibited eating of Blood, grounding himself upon this Principle of *Deuteronomy*, *Blood is the Soul of the Flesh*, thereby

Deut. 12.

by to prejudice that Soul, which Jesus declared in the Gospel, was not lyable to corporal harm or punishment.

St. *Augustin* replys, the Old Law speaks of the Animal Soul, and the Words of Christ are only understood of the Rational. Secondly, the Holy Doctor tells him, that Blood is called the Soul, only because it is the Sign of the Soul. This he confirms (accommodating himself to the Language of the Manichees, who were of opinion, that Bread, Corn and Grapes, naturally signified Christ's Body) with this Instance, *our Saviour did not doubt to say, this is my Body, when he gave* (in the Manichees Opinion) *the Sign of his Body.* The Manichees Opinion was not St. *Austin's.* And he therefore forewarns us *to call in question Faith,* because he made use *of the Manichee's Principle* in their own confutation.

Signum Animæ.

Lib. 3. de lib. Arb. *Nunquid ideo Fides in dubium vocanda vel differenda est.*

Paragraph II.

SAINT *Austin* speaking of *Judas, whom our* Lord admitted to his last Supper, has these Words, *in which he recommended and delivered to his Disciples, the Figure of his Body.* Language, say you with exclamation, *which would now be censured for Heresie in the Church of Rome.*

Ennaret. in Ps. 3.

I'm confident you are already persuaded to the contrary. And I know not any Sect, which holds a Figure incompatible with the reality. I shall cite two of your Learned Patrons; *Peter Martyr* says, *A Figure, as far forth as 'tis a Figure, is not repugnant to the presence of the thing.* And *Calvin* before him granted, *a Figure doth not exclude the thing figurated.* The Lutherans are not of a contrary mind. And if you'll be pleased to look either into the Ancient or Modern Divines among Catholics, you'll find the same acknowledgment. *Paschasius* formerly gave this answer to *Frudegardus*, instancing St. *Austin's* Testimony, *These are,* Replys *Paschasius, Mystical things, in which is the verity of Flesh and Blood, and none others than Christ's, yet in a Mysterie, and Figure, and the Words of this Mystery are called a Figurative Speech; so Christ himself is called, by the Apostle, a Figure, though Christ be the Truth.* *Algerus* illustrates the same, with this Reflection upon St. *John Baptist, He was called a Prophet, and more than a Prophet.* So the Sacrament is a Figure, and more than a Figure. To

Pet. Mart. contra Gen. Luth. Admonit. ult.

Pasch. Epla. ad Frudeg.

Alg. l. 1. c. 7.

(a) Art. 13. (b) Sup. Auch.
(d) L. 1. de Eucha. cap. 32.
(e) 3. p. d. 46. Sect. 4.
(f) Contro. 3. cap. 9.
(g) Sup. Auch.
St. Aug. de S. Virg.

theſe I add of the Modern Catholic Schoolmen. (a) *Ruardus*, (b) *Melderus*, (d) Cardinal *Alen*, (e) *Suarez*, (f) *Gordon*, (g) *Gonet*. And I never read any that held the contrary. And I conclude with this of St. *Auſtin*; *The Bleſſed Virgin did not onely conceive Chriſt ſpiritually by Faith, conſenting to the Angelical Salutation, but alſo conceived him corporally, in her own Womb.* How then doth the ſpiritual reception by Faith exclude the ſubſtantial Communion of Chriſt's Body in St. *Auſtin*'s Opinion?

Paragraph III.

IN the Third Place you cite his Comment on the 98th *Pſalm*, where treating of the ſcandal which the Diſciples took at that ſaying of our Saviour, *except ye eat the Fleſh of the Son of man, and drink his Blood*, he brings in our Saviour ſpeaking thus to them, *ye muſt underſtand ſpiritually, what I have ſaid unto you, ye are not to eat this Body which ye ſee, and to drink this Blood which ſhall be ſhed by thoſe that ſhall crucify me, I have commended a certain Sacrament to you, which being Spiritually underſtood, will give you Life.*

This is as much as to ſay, be not ſcandalized, that I told you, ye ſhall eat my Fleſh, and drink my Blood, ye ſhall not eat it as ye imagine, in the ſhape you ſee it, bruzing, cutting, digeſting my Fleſh. I Speak of a Sacrament, when I commend the eating of my Body; 'Tis this Sacrament you ſhall taſt, touch, and ſee in outward appearance. The Spiritual intelligence by Faith will (diſcovering there my Body remaining inviſibly) vivify you. What more conformable to the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation?

This I ſhall endeavour to manifeſt in examining the ſenſe of theſe two Propoſitions, which contain the force of your Argument. 1. Ye muſt *underſtand ſpiritually what I have ſaid.* 2. *Ye are not to eat the Body which ye ſee.*

The Word *Spiritually*, excluding the Carnal ſenſe of the Capharnaits, eſtabliſhes a miraculous or a ſupernatural underſtanding. So when St. *Paul* ſays, *Iſaac was born according to the Spirit*, He did not deny by this, that *Iſaac* was born of the Fleſh; but declared that the Power of God was required to fecundate

Gal. 4. 29.

the

the barrenneſs of his Mother. In like manner, when St. *Auſtin* names this Word *Spiritually*, or Word of Spirit, he does not deny that the Bread is Fleſh, but intimates that the power of God is required to quicken Bread into the Body of Chriſt. And thus the firſt Propoſition, *Ye muſt underſtand what I have ſaid ſpiritually*, does not at all diminiſh the reality of Chriſt's Subſtance in the Sacrament.

The Second Propoſition, *Ye are not to eat this Body which ye ſee*, properly denotes the Quality or divers exiſtence of Chriſt's Body. Thus St. *Ambroſe* ſaid that the change of Life is ſufficient to verify this Speech, *I am not I*, I juſtified, am not I a ſinner, and yet I am the ſame man in ſubſtance. L. 2. de Pœnia, c. 20. *Ego non ſum ego.*

Thus St. *Lanfrancus* anſwered *Berengarius*, alledging the ſame Paſſage which you object out of St. *Auſtin*, *'Tis not the ſame, if we conſider the manner of Chriſt's exiſtence in the Sacrament, 'tis the ſame if we regard the Subſtance.*

L. Averſ. Bereng. *Idem quoad ſubſtantiam, non idem quoad modum.*

Thus the very ſame Paſſage is cited in *Gratian* with this addition, *Ye are not to eat this Body which ye ſee, I have recommended a certain Sacrament to you, which being Spiritually underſtood will give you Life, ye are to eat him, and not to eat him, ye are to eat him viſibly (under the ſpecies of Bread) ye are not to eat him viſibly in the ſhape of Fleſh.*

Apud Gratian. de Conſecratione, d. 11. *Ipſum & non ipſum, Ipſum inviſibiliter & non ipſum viſibiliter.*

And leſt we ſhould doubt of the reality of his Fleſh in the Sacrament, St. *Auſtin* has left us this invincible Argument, in the ſame Place of your Objection, *He will* (ſays this Father) *give us that Fleſh, which he received from* Mary, *in which he walked on Earth, and which is firſt to be adored, before we receive it.* Language which the Church of *England* will cenſure for Hereſie!

De Carne Mariæ Carnem accepit, in ipſa Carne hic ambulavit, & ipſam Carnem nobis manducandum dedit, nemo illam Carnem manducat niſi prius adoraverit.

Paragraph IV.

YOU inſtance this Teſtimony, *According to that Fleſh which was born of the Virgin* Mary, *ye ſhall not have me, He is aſcended up into Heaven and is not here.* Tract. 5. in John.

The forementioned Solution ſatisfies this Objection, for we are not to have him in his Natural Exiſtence, we are to receive him in a Sacramental Exiſtence.

Thus the variation of ſtate and change of life cauſed the great Apoſtle to ſay, there were two Bodys in man, *The Animal Body, and the Spiritual Body*; The Animal Body is a poor Paſſenger upon Earth, ſtrugling with Paſſions, and reſtleſs Agitations. The Spiritual Body, is the glorified Corps, when Soul and Body meet in Eternity. *It is ſown a Natural Body*, ſays St. *Paul, it ſhall riſe a Spiritual Body*. Which St. *Auſtin* thus expreſſes, *It is ſown a Corruptible Body, it riſes an Incorruptible Body.*

1 Cor. 15.

Epl. 146. *Seminatur corruptibile ſurget incorruptibile.*

The divers exiſtence of Chriſt's Fleſh, in Heaven, and on the Croſs, was ſufficient to St. *Jerom*, to call it a Divine Body, and a Terrene Body. Theſe two Bodies are but one in Subſtance, the ſame in Heaven, the ſame on the Croſs, the ſame which the Virgin brought forth, and the ſame in the Sacrament, *Who eats*, ſays St. *Auſtin, of this Fleſh let him firſt adore it.* Adoration teſtifies what it is.

Cap. 1. ad Eph. *Aliam & aliam.*

Paragraph V.

YOU alledge this Similitude from St. *Auſtin, As the Sacrament of the Body of Chriſt is in ſome manner or ſenſe Chriſt's Body, and the Sacrament of his Blood, is the Body of Chriſt, ſo the Sacrament of Faith*, (meaning Baptiſm) *is Faith*, which the gloſs, of the Canon Law, thus expounds. *It's called the Body of Chriſt, that is, it ſignifies the Body of Chriſt.*

Ep. 23. ad Bonifacium.

De Conſecratione 2. hoc eſt.

Boniface inquiring how Infants, when they are baptized, are ſaid to believe, and renounce the Devil, was thus inſtructed by St. *Auſtin*; A Sacrament, or holy ſign, is honoured for the moſt part with the names of the things themſelves, by reaſon of which Similitude the Sacrament of Faith, (Baptiſm) may be called Faith, which Infants receiving are ſaid to believe. This Anſwer exacting a confirmation, obliged the holy Prelate, pitching upon the Similitude of the Sacrament, to caſt his Eyes preciſely on the ſole outward appearance of the Symbols, which in *ſome manner* or ſenſe, are Chriſt's Body and Blood. *Not according to the truth of the thing*, as the Gloſs notes; or as St. *Anſelme* expreſſes, *the viſible appearance of Bread is not the Body of the Lord*, except as the Canon Law expounds it, *improperly and after ſome manner*, as it ſignifies and contains the Body of Chriſt.

St. Anſel. Tract. de Sacram. Altaris, c. 1. *Similitudo illa Panis per ſe inſpecta non eſt Corpus Domini.*

What

What is ſignified or contained is the Myſterie, which is not prejudiced by the foregoing Speech? For a Myſterie properly ſpeaking, is ſome inviſible thing. Such is that of St. *Paul*, *If I know all Myſteries* or hidden things. And the Roman Orator expreſſed himſelf after the ſame manner, when he ſaid, *Keep this ſecret, as a Myſtery.*

St. Paul, 1 Cor. 17. *Si noverim Myſteria omnia.* 3. De Oratore. *Hoc tacitum tanquam Myſterium teneas.*

The viſible appearance then of Bread, though not the true Body of Chriſt, may be called improperly Chriſt's Body; and yet the thing ſignified or contained under this appearance be the true Body of Chriſt. Or as Faith infuſed by baptiſmal regeneration, to uſe St. *Auſtin*'s compariſon, is true Faith; ſo the thing received in the Sacrament, is the true Body of Chriſt.

Paragraph VI.

YOU add this remarkable Paſſage of St. *Auſtin*, cited by *Gratian*; *As we receive the ſimilitude of his Death in Baptiſm, ſo we may alſo receive the likeneſs of his Fleſh and Blood; and ſo neither may truth be wanting in the Sacrament, nor Pagans have occaſion to make us ridiculous for drinking of the Blood of one that was ſlain.*

Apud Gratian. de Conſ. d. 2. ſect. utramque.

St. *Auſtin* here delivers the ſtrict Practice of the Church in his days, hiding from the Pagans the Myſtery of the Sacrament; and adds this Reaſon, in the ſame place: *If the Diſciples of our Lord could not patiently receive what our Lord ſaid, how will theſe Incredulous endure us teaching the ſame Doctrine?* But of this more hereafter.

Si Diſcipuli patienter ferre nequiverunt quod Dominus Dixit, quomodo ferunt iſta increduli?

Nor does this Learned Father more exclude the reality of Fleſh, calling *it the likneſs of Fleſh*: Than St. *Paul*, ſaying, Chriſt appeared whilſt he lived, and converſed with Sinners upon Earth, *in the likeneſs of Man*, deny'd that he was truly Man.

St. Paul, Eph. 2.

'Tis true, many Diſſenters from the Catholic Church, and Hereticks, grounding themſelves on this Scriptural Paſſage, Chriſt appeared *in the likeneſs of Man*, eagerly taught, that he was a Phantaſm, or Appearance, not a natural Man, compoſed of Fleſh and Bone. And you, their Faithful Imitator, gloſs after the ſame manner, not upon Scripture, but upon a ſingle Paſſage of one Father, and this too borrowed from *Gratian.*

But

But with how little reaſon you gloſs after this manner, theſe following Paſſages of S. *Auſtin*, taken out of the ſame *Gratian*, will farther demonſtrate. (*a*) The Firſt is part of the Canon, wherein your Objection is contained. Theſe are his Words, *What exteriorly appears (in the Sacrament) is a Figure; the Truth is the Body and Blood of Chriſt, made of the Subſtance of Bread and Wine.* (*b*) The Second Paſſage is, *We faithfully confeſs it is before Conſecration, Bread and Wine, which Nature made; but after Conſecration, the Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt, which Benediction conſecrated.* (*c*) The Third is the meaning of that Paſſage of our Saviour, *The Bread which I will give*, in the 6th of St. *John*; which words determine in St. *Auſtin*'s mind, *How Chriſt is Bread, not only as he is the Word, which gives all things life; but alſo according to the Fleſh aſſumed for the life of the World.* Is this not real Fleſh?

(*a*) Ibidem. *Veritas, dum Corpus Chriſti & Sanguis, virtute Spiritus S. ex Panis & Vini Subſtantiâ efficitur; figura, quod exterius ſentitur.*

(*b*) De Conſ. d. 11. can. 41. *Fideliter fatemur ante conſecrationem eſſe Panem & Vinum, quod Natura formavit, poſt conſecrationem verò Chriſti Sanguinem, quod benedictio conſecravit.*

(*c*) Can. 57. *Panis quem ego dabo, determinat quomodo ſit Panis, non ſolum ſecundum verbum, quo vivunt omnia, ſed & ſecundum Carnem aſſumptam pro mundi vita.*

Paragraph VII.

YOU mention but one more Teſtimony, *but ſo clear a one, as it is impoſſible any man in his wits, that had believed Tranſubſtantiation, could have uttered.* It is in his Treatiſe, *de Doctrina Chriſtiana*, where laying down ſeveral Rules, for the right underſtanding of Scripture, he gives this for one. *If the Speech be a Precept forbidding ſome heinous wickedneſs, or commanding us to do good, it is not figurative*; if the contrary, *it is figurative*; for example, *except ye eat the Fleſh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, ye have no life in you:* this ſeems to command a heinous Crime, therefore it is a Figure, commanding us to communicate of the Paſſion of our Lord.

If I ſhould deny, that St. *Auſtin* ſpeaks here of receiving the Sacrament, you would be puzled to find out a warrant for your famous Aſſertion. For many Learned Writers judiciouſly remark, that theſe words, *except ye eat of my Fleſh*, in Saint *Auſtin*'s Senſe may be thus explicated, except ye eat it by Faith, by Piety, by Good Works, which is a Spiritual Communion (out of the Sacrament) of the Paſſion of our Lord. And if this be

be true, as it is more than probably ſo, St. *Auſtin* ſays here what all Catholics profeſs; For we all ſay we may communicate ſpiritually of the Paſſion of Chriſt by Faith believing in Jeſus, when we receive not the Sacrament; and yet we believe in the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation.

But if you will ſtill keep this Holy Father, whoſe Learning has always been the Admiration of Mankind, *out of his wits*, to uſe your Phraſe; a ſlight reflection, ſuppoſing he ſpeaks here of Sacramental Communion, will help him to return to himſelf, and reconcile him to the Catholic Affirmation.

I think one of a mean Capacity can diſtinguiſh the manner of eating, and the thing eaten. Which if true, St. *Auſtin* may literally underſtand the thing eaten in the Sacrament, to be the true Fleſh of Chriſt, God and Man; and yet at the ſame inſtant hold, that the manner of eating this Fleſh, (to which this Paſſage, *except ye eat my Fleſh*, has referenee) is Spiritual. For although the true Body be taken in the ſhape of Bread, into the Mouth, and let down into the Stomack, yet it is not ground with the Teeth, or ſeparated in pieces. We are taught after a Spiritual manner to eat the Fleſh of the Son of Man. Liſſen to the Voice of God, and you'l hear the Goſpel mention eating a Man, *take, eat, this is my Body.* The manner is Spiritual, for the Body is given in the ſhape of Bread; and in this Senſe St. *Auſtin* calls theſe words, *except ye eat my Fleſh*, a figurative Speech. The Subſtance or the thing eaten is not here mentioned by the Saint. But it is the true Body of Chriſt, as the ſame Saint aſſures us elſe-where in theſe Lines; *We believe* (in the Sacrament) *with faithful heart and mouth the Mediator of God and Man, Chriſt Jeſus, giving us his Body to be eaten, and his Blood to be drank, although it appear more horrible to eat, than to kill Human Fleſh; to drink, than to ſpill Human Blood.*

Matth. 26.

L. 2. Contra Adverſ. Leg. & Proph. c. 9.

Hominem Chriſtum Jeſum Carnem ſuam nobis manducandum bibendumque Sanguinem dantem fideli corde, atque ore ſuſcipimus, quamvis horribilius videatur, Humanam Carnem perimere, quàm manducare, & Humanum Sanguinem potare, quàm fundere.

Every word almoſt inſtances a new Argument, for the truth of the Fleſh. This oral *receiving with mouth God and Man*; This horror of eating and drinking Fleſh and Blood; this Antitheſis between eating and killing, drinking and ſpilling, terminated to the ſame ſubſtance, leaves not the leaſt ſcruple to doubt, that the thing eaten is real Fleſh and Blood. And pray what horror would

would there be, to eat an Image of Fleſh? or what Language ſpeaks of killing the Figure of a Man? The ſame Saint, in his Expoſition on the 33d Pſalm, hath this Paſſage; *He's truly our Lord, who truly gave us his Body to eat, in which he ſo much ſuffered.* Elſewhere he ſays, the *Faithful receive into their mouth that Blood which redeemed them.* And in his 27th Treatiſe on St. *John*, ſpeaking of St. *Peter*'s Confeſſion, I find this remarkable Sentence; *You are Chriſt the Son of the living God, and what you give in your Fleſh and Blood, is nothing elſe but your own ſelf.*

In Pſal. 33. *In quo tanta perpeſſus eſt.*

Contra Fauſtum, l. 2. c. 10. *Sanguinem quo redempti ſunt.*

Tract. 27. in John. *Tu es Chriſtus Filius Dei vivi, nec dixs in Carne & Sanguine tuo, niſi teipſum.*

Now you muſt acknowledge the way I have preſcribed, or find ſome other expedient, to reconcile St. *Auſtin*'s Wit with the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, or all the World will imagine, you put your own to a deſperate adventure.

Article VII.

YOU mention two Teſtimonies out of *Theodoretus*'s Dialogues between a Catholic under the name of *Orthodoxus*, and a Heretic under the name of *Eraniſtes*, who maintained with the Eutichians, that the Humanity of Chriſt after the Aſcenſion, was changed into the Divinity. I'll examine each apart.

Paragraph I.

The Diſpute of Orthodoxus *and* Eraniſtes *in the Firſt Dialogue.*

ORthodoxus undertakes to ſhew that the Humanity of Chriſt alwaies remain'd. This he proves, becauſe the Humanity was a Vail or Garment to the Divinity, as we read in *Geneſis*, where *Jacob* prophecy'd of the Meſſias, *He waſhed his Garment in Wine, and his Cloaths in the Blood of the Grape.* *Eraniſtes* replys, this is underſtood literally of his proper Habit, with which he was cloathed upon Earth. *Orthodoxus* reſumes, that Jeſus called himſelf the Vine, and the Fruit of the Vine, is Wine; and the Blood of our Saviour is called the Blood of the Vine. And if our Saviour be called the Vine, and the Fruit

Gen. 49.

Fruit of the Vine, is Wine; and from the ſide of our Saviour ran Fountains of Blood, on the reſt of his Body: The Prophet rightly foretold that *He waſhed his Robe in Wine, and his Cloths in the Blood of the Grape.* Again ſpeaking to *Eraniſtes*, he purſues with another Simile, Jeſus called his Body Bread, and his Fleſh Wheat; But in the inſtitution of the Sacrament he called Bread his Body, and Wine his Blood; Though naturally the Body is called the Body, and Blood is called Blood; but our Saviour changing the Names, gave to his Body the Name of Symbol, and to the Symbol or Sign, the Name of his Body. *Eraniſtes* urges to know the cauſe of this change of Names. *Orthodoxus* anſwers, Nothing more eaſie to the Faithful. *For he would have thoſe who partake of the Divine Myſteries, not to attend to the nature of things, which are ſeen, but by the change of Names, to believe the change which is made by Grace; for he who called that, which by nature is a Body, Wheat and Bread, and again called himſelf the Vine, he honoured the Symbol with the name of his Body and Blood, not changing nature, but adding Grace to nature.* This is a full view of the matter in debate.

We ought to reflect, that as *Theodoretus* compares here Scriptural paſſages, wherein they reſemble one another, and conſequently acknowledges the Similitude of the already mention'd Expreſſions. So alſo was he not ignorant of their differences. And therefore he ſaid, *Jeſus changed the Names, that by their change the Faithful might believe, that alteration which Grace effected.*

Per nominum mutationem mutationi quæ ex gratia facta eſt fidem adhibere.

The change of names is acknowledged to proceed from a change made in the Sacrament. For he obliges the Faithful to believe a change which is made, *not in the nature of things which are ſeen*, for the natural Signs or outward appearances remain; it muſt be then in ſome inward thing, not ſeen, or Subſtance of the Symbol effected by Grace, or the Word of God. This in another place he profeſſes in theſe Words, *Chriſt gave his pretious Body not only to the Eleven Apoſtles, but alſo to the Traytor Judas.* This cannot be properly *Grace added to Nature*, for *Judas* received his own condemnation. It muſt be then the Body of Chriſt made by Grace of the Subſtance of Bread, and added to the Nature or remaining appearance of the Signs which was given to the Traytor.

Comm in Epla. ad Cor.

Paragraph II.

Upon the continuation of the ſame Diſcourſe in the Second Dialogue.

Orthod. What are thoſe Symbols, which the Prieſt offers to God? *Eraniſt.* They are Symbols of the Body and Blood of our Lord. *Orthod.* Of the true Body? *Eraniſt.* *Of the true Body.* *Orthod.* Very right. *Eraniſt.* Very well. *Orthod.* *If theſe Divine Myſteries repreſent the true Body, the true Body of Chriſt is not changed into the Divinity.* *Eraniſtes* perceiving himſelf caught, cunningly retorts the Argument, in the like manner. How do you call theſe Symbols after conſecration? *Orthod.* The Body and Blood of Chriſt. *Eraniſt.* Do you believe you receive the Body and Blood of Chriſt? *Orthod.* I do believe. *Eraniſt.* Therefore as the Symbols of our Lord's Body and Blood, are one thing before the invocation of the Prieſt, *but after the invocation are changed and become another thing, ſo the Body of our Lord after his aſcenſion, is changed into the Divine Subſtance.*

If *Orthodoxus* had not believed that the Symbols were truly changed in Subſtance after conſecration, how could *Eraniſtes* have deduced the change of the Human Nature into the Divine Subſtance? He could not argue this out of his own principle. For admitting no Body of Chriſt in Heaven, how could he pretend a real Body of Chriſt in the Sacrament? whence the Proteſtant Centuriators ſay, *Theodoretus dangerouſly affirms*, that *the Symbols of the Body and Blood of Chriſt after the invocation of the Prieſt are changed, and become another thing.*

Cent. 5. c. 10. *Periculoſe dicit.*

Orthodoxus anſwers, *you are caught in your own net, becauſe the Myſtical Symbols after Conſecration do not paſs out of their own Nature, for they remain in their former Subſtance, Figure and Appearance, and may be ſeen and handled even as before.*

As Bread is properly ſaid to have Subſtance and Nature, which are neither ſeen, nor handled; ſo likewiſe the Accidents of Bread may be ſaid, though not ſo commonly, to have their own Nature and Subſtance, which may be ſeen and handled. Whence that of St. *Auſtin*, *What is not a Subſtance is nothing at all.* 'Tis in this ſenſe *Orthodoxus* holds, the ſubſtance of the Symbols remains. And leſt we ſhould doubt what this ſubſtance is, he tells us 'tis *Figure and Appearance.* Nor is this a conſtrained interpretation:

St. Aug. Enarr. in Pſal. 68. *Quod nulla ſubſtantia eſt, nihil omnino eſt.*

terpretation: For what more uſual, when we have uttered ſome word, either harſh in expreſſion, or difficult to be underſtood, than forthwith to add another, ſofter in Language, and more obvious to the Hearer. Thus *Theodoretus* ſaying, *They remain in their former ſubſtance*, adds, that is, *they remain in their former Figure and appearance, and may be ſeen and handled, even as before.* Nor are theſe latter Expreſſions referable to Subſtance, ſtrictly taken for the inward thing, becauſe this properly, is neither ſeen nor handled.

Now if you ask what theſe Symbols are interiorly, *Theodoretus* confeſſes, *they are, what they were made, Chriſt's Body.* And they *are believed and adored as being thoſe very things which they are believed.* Which Words, if the Bread be not ſubſtantially changed into Chriſt's Body, teach plain Idolatry. *Intelliguntur ea eſſe quæ facta ſunt, & adorantur & creduntur.*

Nor could *Orthodoxus* ſay the interiour Subſtance of the Symbols, was not changed, in his own Opinion; for this he had already granted, in theſe Words, *They are changed and become after conſecration another thing.*

Orthodoxus pretends indeed that he caught his Adverſary in his own Net. But this was not becauſe *Eraniſtes* believed the Subſtance of the Symbols was not changed into Chriſt's Body; for he thought Chriſt's Body was no where extant. How then was he caught in his own Net? He was caught in his own Net, becauſe theſe Myſtical Symbols, were not changed in appearance, (*for after conſecration they may be ſeen and handled*) and they *were Symbols ſtill of Chriſt's true Body*, which *Eraniſtes* had formerly granted; and therefore there was a true Body of Chriſt; and ſo the Body of Chriſt was not changed into the Divinity, as *Orthodoxus* had argued. Thus *Eraniſtes* was caught in his own Net.

Nor ought *Theodoretus* to be cenſured for Singularity, in giving the Name of Nature and Subſtance, to accidental Beings. For St. *Hilary* gives the ſame to Proprieties; Saying, *That the Flames in the Babilonian Furnace, loſt their Nature, though the Subſtance of the Fire remained.* St. Hilary. *Naturam ſuam amiſerunt.*

Innocent the Third, that Venerable Pope and Father of the Church, under whom was defined the Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation, frankly concedes the Natural Proprieties of Bread remain, *ut paneitas.* And Cardinal *Pole*, another great Vindicator of the ſame Tenet, ſays, *Though there be only Fleſh and*

Card. Pole, p. 8. c. 3. de Euch. *Cum in Dominica menſa ſit ſolùm Caro & Sanguis, nihilominus Vini natura percipiatur.*

Blood in the Sacrament, notwithſtanding the Nature of the Wine may be taſted. I would have you likewiſe argue, that theſe Authors are againſt Tranſubſtantiation.

Article VIII.

Upon Gelaſius *the Pope.*

THESE Words of *Gelaſius*, *The Subſtance of Bread and Wine, doth not ceaſe to be*, are already ſatisfied by what I have ſaid to *Theodoretus*, that is, the outward ſhape of Bread remains. And if theſe Words immediately following what you objected, had been cited, the difficulty would have been removed. *They* (the inward Subſtance of Bread and Wine) *paſs by the operation of the Holy Ghoſt into a Divine Nature, yet remaining in the propriety of their Nature.* It is only the Proprieties of the Nature of the Bread and Wine, the Colour, and the Taſt, that remain. The Subſtance is changed; For how could the inward Subſtance of Bread and Wine paſs by Divine operation into Chriſt's Body, and not ceaſe to be? how can a Proteſtant paſs into the Roman Catholic Church, and become a pious Member thereof, and not truly ceaſe to be a Proteſtant?

Gelaſ. de duab. Nat. Bib. Pſal. Tom. 4.

This *Gelaſius* is not the learned Pope *Gelaſius*; and I need not labour to prove this. Your own Critics write, that that Treatiſe *de duabus naturis*, whence you borrowed this Objection, belongs to ſome other of the ſame Name. I ſhall inſtance only one reaſon. This Author ranks the Works of *Euſebius Cæſarienſis* among thoſe of the Orthodox Fathers, which cannot be ſaid of the pious and learned Pope *Gelaſius*, who numbers the ſame *Euſebius* in his own Authentic Works, with Apocryphal Writers. There is then not one of our Popes againſt Tranſubſtantiation: And if you cannot alledg one Pope from the beginning of Chriſtianity, who teaches contrary to what is now profeſſed in the Roman Church, concerning this conteſted Article of Faith, is it not a great Argument that it was alwaies taught in the Church of God?

Article

Article IX.

Upon Facundus.

Facundus the African Biſhop, juſtifying *Theodorus Mopſueſtenus*, who had ſaid, *That Chriſt alſo received the adoption of Sons*, reaſons thus, *Chriſt vouchſafed to receive the Sacrament of Adoption, both when he was circumciſed and baptized; and the Sacrament of Adoption may be called Adoption, as the Sacrament of his Body and Blood is by us called his Body and Blood.* Facund. p. 144.

The intern Grace of the Holy Ghoſt received in Baptiſm, properly conſtitutes us the true Sons adoptive of God, which could not be conferr'd on our Saviour; for he was enriched with the plenitude of perfection, and was the natural Son of God. Yet Chriſt may be ſaid, *Facundus* urges, to receive the Adoption of Sons, becauſe he vouchſafed to receive Baptiſm, the Sacrament of Adoption. Then ſeeking an Example to verify that Baptiſm may be called Adoption, though it was not, but only contain'd the Grace of Adoption, was forced inſtancing the Bleſſed Sacrament, barely to conſider the Sacrament in the outward Species of Bread in the Euchariſt, which may be called the Body and Blood of Chriſt; becauſe it contains the Body and Blood of Chriſt. What is contain'd in Baptiſm, is it not the proper Grace of Adoption? and what is contained in the Conſecrated Species, is the true Body and Blood of Chriſt.

Can any after this believe, that what you have objected, prejudices in the leaſt the Univerſal and received Doctrin of the Chriſtian Church, of Bread and Wine ſubſtantially chang'd in the Sacrament into the proper and true Body and Blood of Chriſt?

What you repeat by way of Appendix, the Names of ſome Catholic Divines, is inconſiderable. Only this I can ſay, you might have more prudently omitted them in your own behalf, than chang'd their Words in detriment to the Catholic Doctrin. For *Scotus* only ſays, that the truth of ſome Articles, *is more explicit* or manifeſt *in the Lateran Decrees, than it was in the Symbols of the Apoſtles, or in the Athanaſian Creed,*

Scotus, l. 4. & 11. q. 3. n. 18. ad 3. In Concil. Lat. *Ubi explicitè ponitur veritas, aliquorum Credendorum magis explicite quàm habebatur in Symbolo Apoſtolorum, vel Athanaſii, vel Nicæni, & bre-*

viter, quidquid ibi dicitur esse Credendum, tenendum est esse de substantia Fidei.

or that of Nice; and in a word, what ever is here defin'd (in the Council of *Lateran*) *is to be held as a sincere part of our Faith.*

Durandus does not say, that he would have been of a contrary Opinion, had not the Church defin'd for Transubstantiation; but only tacitly insinuates, that he would have made use of the Bread and Wine, remaining with the Body of Christ in the Sacrament, which was possible to God, though really false, in order to solve some Objections, had not the Canon of the Church interven'd. Nor ought we to be surpris'd at this. For *Durandus* ordinarily walked on the brink of Faith in Assertions, and therefore merited the Title of *Temerarius Doctor* in the Church of God. These are his Words, *The Substance of Bread and Wine is changed into the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ; yet although this be really true, it was possible to God that the Body of Christ might have been in the Sacrament, with the Substance of Bread, which is not really true, for the Church has decreed the contrary, and she is presum'd not to err in her decisions; Therefore holding the Bread chang'd into Christ's Body, I answer to the contrary Objections.*

Durand. 4. & Numb. 9. *Substantia Panis & Vini convertitur in substantiam Corporis & Sanguinis Christi. Quamvis iste modus sit de facto, non est tamen negandum quin alius modus sit Deo possibilis, scil. quod remanente substantia Panis & Vini, Corpus & Sanguis Christi esset in Sacramento.*

Et Numb. 18. *Sed quia hic modus non debet teneri, de facto, cum Ecclesia determinavit oppositum, quæ non presumitur errare in talibus: ideo tenendo de facto aliam partem, respondendum est ad argumenta quæ sunt in contrarium.*

Tunstal Bishop of *Durham* says, from the beginning of Christianity, no body doubted of the real presence of Christ in the Sacrament, and that the Learned Ancient Writers look'd upon the manner, how the Bread passed into Christ's Body, as inscrutable and not to be searched into, lest we should seem to tempt Christ with the Capernaits, doubting how this can be? *But through God-almighty's power, to whom not hing is impossible, the change of Bread into Christ's Body* (by Transubstantiation) *seem'd to* Innocent *the Third, and those who sat with him in Council, to agree most with these Words of Christ, This is my Body.* And he censures those who deny this change, with impudent boldness, and opposes them to Christ; saying, *If we believe them* (who profess your Error) *neither Christ nor the Holy Ghost, can change Bread into the Substance of Christ's Body, whose Word made all things of nothing.*

Tunstal de Euchar. *Sed Omnipotentia Dei cui nihil est impossibile, his qui eum* Innocentio *in eo Concilio interfuerunt visum est, quod is modus maxime, cum verbis hisce Christi, hoc est Corpus meum, congruere illis visus est.*

Si illis credimus, nec Christus, nec Spiritus Sanctus id efficere possit, ut panis in Corporis Christi substantiam transeat.

Tell

Tell me what was *Eraſmus's* Thought, and I'le anſwer what Religion he was of. In ſome places he favours the Lutherans, oftentimes he's a Catholic; I am ſure he's not a Proteſtant in that Epiſtle to *Conradus*; *If you are perſuaded there's nothing beſides Bread and Wine in the Sacrament, I had rather be torn in pieces, than profeſs what you profeſs.*

Epiſtola ad Conradum Pellicanum de Euch. *Si tibi perſuaſum eſt in Synaxi nihil eſſe præter Panem & Vinum, ego membratim diſcerpi malim quam profiteri quod tu profiteris, & omnia perpeti malim, quam tali flagitio contra meam conſcientiam admiſſo ex hac vita migrare.*

If *Alphonſus* ſay ther's ſeldom mention in Ancient Writers concerning Tranſubſtantiation, theſe ſeldom Intimations are ſufficient to ſhew, that 'twas always taught in the Church of God, which ought to convince any unbyaſed Underſtanding.

Alph. à Caſtro de Herſ. l. 8.

CHAP. II.

An Account of the coming in of Tranſubſtantiation.

I Have already done this to your hand. 'Twas inſtituted by our Saviour. I ſuppoſe then you mean a particular Account of the coming in of the Error againſt Tranſubſtantiation, and by what attempts and degrees it was advanced againſt the Romiſh Church.

The firſt Oppoſers of this Doctrin, were the Capharnaits, who ſcandaliz'd at our Saviour's Promiſe, cry'd out, *How can this Man give us his Fleſh to eat?* This was ſeconded with the Complaint of his own Diſciples; *This is a hard ſaying, and who can hear it?* Both were taxed with Incredulity, as St. *John* writes in his Sixth Chapter. And St. *Auſtin* calls them Heretics, *Judas* heading them *as their Prince and Leader*, in whom, without our envy, you may triumph and glory. How often have you been incredulous with the Capharnaits, ſaying, *How can he give us his Fleſh?* How often with the unfaithfull Diſciples murmured, *who can endure this Doctrin?*

In Pſal. 24. & Tract. in Joan. *Dux & Anteſignanus.*

A ſecond attempt was, as St. *Paul* delivers, made by the Corinthians, who not diſtinguiſhing the Body of our Lord in the Sacrament, from Bread and Wine, became incredulous, *Not believing.* Not believing what? St. *Auſtin* replies, *the true Body of Chriſt to be contain'd in the Euchariſt.*

1 Cor. 11. *Non credentes.* S. Aug. Ep. 118. c. 3. *Non credentes in Euch. contineri verum Chriſtum.*

A third

A third Eſſay muſt be acknowledged in the Simonits, Menandrians, Gnoſtics, and Marcioniſts, who placing in Chriſt only a Phantaſm, indirectly rejected the verity of Chriſt's true Body and Blood in the Sacrament.

A fourth Oppoſition was from ſome of the Arians, who thirſting after Spiritual Grace, were not ſolicitous for any Corporal Preſence, as we learn from St. *Cyril*, and St. *Gregory Nazianzen.*

St. Cyril. Alex. in John, l. 10. c. 13.

St. Greg. Naz. Orat. 2. de Paſchate.

In the Year 740. we read of certain Heretics meeting together for the taking away of Images, who gave this reaſon; *That our Lord having left no Image of himſelf but Bread, which is the Image of his Body, we ought to make no other Image of our Lord.* This Conventicle, which then was eſteemed Heretical in the Chriſtian World, you mention, make Orthodox, and oppoſe it to the Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation.

You are here again miſtaken, for there was no Sect of Men who profeſſed at this time in any place of the World your Opinion againſt Tranſubſtantiation. For theſe Heretics taking the word *Image* interiourly, for the Subſtance it ſelf; ſaid, that as our Saviour *deified Fleſh which ſuffered for man's redemption, ſo (conſtituting the Euchariſtic Bread, not a falſe Image of his natural Fleſh) he did ordain it ſhould be made, the Prieſt mediating by the ſanctification of the Holy Ghoſt, his Divine Body.* Theſe Words, as containing the Roman Belief, were approved in the Nicene Synod. Nor did the Writers of the Roman Church, condemning their Hereſie which pulled down and deſtroyed Images, charge them with any disbelief of the real Preſence, or Tranſubſtantiation.

Ex Pſeudo-Synodo Iconomacorum An. 740.

Euchariſtiæ Panem, ut non falſam imaginem, naturalis carnis per S. Spiritus adventum Sanctificandum Divinum Corpus fieri voluit mediante Sacerdote.

Nic. 2. *Dimiſſo mendacio tangunt paucillum quid veritatem Divinum Corpus dicentes fieri.*

Theſe Iconoclaſt Heretics indiſcreetly naming the *Bread* the *Image* of the Body of Chriſt, gave probably occaſion to the following Writers to diſpute how it was an *Image.* Amongſt whom *Scotus Erigena*, towards the end of the Eight, or beginning of the Ninth Century, went ſo far, that he ſaid, *'twas only an Image of the Body.* Scarce had he broach'd this new Doctrin, but he was ſtraight cenſured by the Writers of thoſe Times.

Hincmarus

Hincmarus accuſed him *that he called the Sacrament a remembrance only of the true Body and Blood of Chriſt.* *Prudentius* Biſhop of *Troy*, and *Ebbo* Prelat of *Grenoble*, confuted the ſame *Erigena*. Nor did this *Scotus* decline the ſiniſter Opinion of Pope *Nicholas*, in his Letter to *Charles* the *Bald*, *Scotus*'s great Patron and Friend. Yet we never read that *Scotus* ever reply'd in defence of his Error, and ſo ſeem'd in ſome manner to retract what before he had imprudently ſpoken. His Followers were but few, and thoſe too, taught this Error underhand, ſo fearfully, that no body could accuſe them of open Hereſie, or convince them not to be Catholics. Thus this Infant *Embrio* of Error covered in the Shell of darkneſs, was at length hatch'd and brought forth by *Berengarius* in the twelfth Age.

Hincmarus in Scot. *Memoria tantùm veri Corporis & Sanguinis Chriſti.*

Berengarius was born at *Tours* in *France*. After he had finiſhed the ordinary courſes of Studies, he taught Grammar and Philoſophy. Then he was made Treaſurer in St. *Martin*'s Church. About the Year 1149, he went for *Angers*, where he was kindly entertained, and conſtituted by *Bruno* the Arch Biſhop, his Archdeacon. Here he began to ſow ſeveral Errors; *Viz.* That Children were not to be baptized; that Marriage might be diſſolved; that our Saviour could not enter in where his Diſciples were, *The Door's ſhut*; as we learn from *Guitmundus*, *Theoduinus*, *Januis Clauſis.* and St. *Anſelm*. He added a fourth Error, which is to our preſent purpoſe, That the conſecrated Bread *was only a Figure of Chriſt's Body.* Which, that he might the better maintain, he kept poor Boys to School, educating them in all manner of Learning, that ſo by mony and intereſt, he might have many at his command. But alas all in vain, for this Error no ſooner was vented, but it was oppoſed by many Learned Writers. Among theſe, were St. *Lanfrancus*, St. *Anſelm*, (a) *Guitmundus*, *Durandus*, *Algerus*, (b) *Adelmannus*, *Hugo Lingonenſis*, *Humbertus*, (c) *Petrus Cluniacenſis*, (d) *Euthymius*, (e) *Hugo Victorinus*, (f) *Petrus Lombardus*. And the ſame *Berengarius* more than once abjured his Error, which during his life was nine times condemned in nine ſeveral Councils. The firſt at *Rome* under *Leo* the Ninth. The Second at *Vercells*. The Third in the

Guit. l. 1. contra Bereng. Theod. Ep. ad Henricum Galliæ in Bib. Pp. *St.* Anſ. de Sacram. Altaris, c. 3.

(a) *In ſuis Libris de Corpore & Sanguine Domini.*
(b) In Exempl. ad Bereng.
(c) In Ep. adv. Petrum B.
(d) In cap. 26. Matth.
(e) L. 2. de Sacramento, p. 8. c. 7.
(f) L. 4. Sect. d. 11.

Convent of *Brion*, according to the desires of *Henry* Duke of *Normandy*, to whom he fled for protection. The Fourth at *Paris*. The Fifth at *Tours*, by order from Pope *Victor*. The Sixth at *Rome* under *Nicholas* the Second. The Seventh at *Poictous* in *France*. The Eighth at *Rome* under *Gregory* the Seventh. The Ninth at *Bourdeaux*, under *Hugo Bien* Bishop and Legat of the See Apostolic in *France*. This we have from the Writers of those times cited in *Baronius*. The last abjuration of this Heresie made by *Berengarius*, was real. For after ten years Penance, he died peaceably in the Bosom of the Church. This we have from (a) *William* of *Malemsbury*, (b) *Mathew Paris*, *Vincentius Bellovacensis*; and what is most convincing, we read in an Old Manuscript, in St. *Martin*'s at *Tours*, these Words, *Obiit Magister Berengarius, Grammaticus fidelis, et vere Catholicus.* An. Dom. 1186. Many of those whom he had perverted, imitated his pious return to the Church, and his Penance. Others more unfortunate, propogated this Figurative Exposition, and Exclusion of Christ's Body in the Sacrament, after the best manner, Industry could invent, and Craft execute.

Baron. ad Ann. 1055, &c.

(a) L. 3. de gestis Angl.
(b) In Henrico 2. Imp.

Hence you may gather what diligence the Enemy of Mankind used; how often he was forced to repeat, almost the same Stratagems, before the fearful Error durst publickly appear, or was able to stand in any corner of Christendom.

Pray now compare, if you please, the rise of Transubstantiation with the beginning of the opposite contradiction; and acknowledge without prejudice or partiality, which of the two ought to be sincerely embraced. Whether will you believe, Nine several Councils, or *Berengarius* an Apostate, who yet afterwards recanted? Whether the Holy Fathers, who vindicated this Catholic Doctrin, St. *Austin*, St. *Hilary*, St. *Ambrose*, St. *Cyril*, St. *Justin*, St. *Ignatius Martyr*; or the Marcionits, Menandrians, Simonits, all Hereties, who deny the Substantial Body of Christ? Whether lastly, you believe St. *Paul*, or the Erring Corinthians; St. *John*, or the incredulous Jews; our Blessed Saviour, or the Contradicting Calvinists? I leave you to your own choice, whilst I pursue your third Principle.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Examen of your Solution given to Mr. Arnauld's *Demonſtration.*

MR. *Arnauld*, a learned man in *France*, pretended very rightly, that it was impoſſible, that our Doctrin, if it had been new, ſhould ever have come in, in any Age, and been received in the Church, and conſequently it muſt of neceſſity have been the perpetual Belief of the Church in all Ages. For if it had not been always the Doctrin of the Church, when ever it had attempted firſt to come in, there would have been a great ſtir and buſsle about it, and the whole Chriſtian World would have roſe up in oppoſition to it. But you have ſhewn no ſuch time, when firſt it came in, and when any ſuch oppoſition was made to it, and therefore it was always the Doctrin of the Church.

It is true, you would fain have me believe, that *Rabanus*, Archbiſhop of *Mentz*, and *Heribaldus*, Biſhop of *Auxerre*, and *Bertram* oppoſed this Doctrin with all their might. But what you have alledg'd from their Writings, do not convince me. *Bertram* indeed ſays, the Writers of that Age talked according to their ſeveral Opinions, *differently about the Myſtery of Chriſt's Body and Blood, and were divided by no ſmall Schiſm.* But what was this Schiſm? This Schiſm or difference according to *Bertram*, preciſely conſiſted in two Queſtions. Firſt, Whether there was a Figure in the Myſtery. Secondly, Whether the Bread that was chang'd into Chriſt's Body, was the Natural Body of Chriſt, which was born of the Virgin *Mary*.

Bertram in the firſt part of his Treatiſe undertook to ſhew, that there was a Figure in the Myſtery, as the concluſion of his Diſcourſe in the end evidences in theſe Terms; *From what I have heitherto ſpoken, 'tis clear, that the Body of Chriſt, which the Faithful receive into their Mouths, is a Figure, if we regard the viſible Species.* And leſt any one ſhould impeach him of Error in the Sacrament, he ſtraight added, *But if we conſider the inviſible Subſtance the Body and Blood truly there exiſt*, Grounding himſelf upon this Principle, *that the Subſtance of Bread*

Bertram de Corpore Domini.

Ex his omnibus quæ hactenus dicta ſunt, monſtratum eſt, Corpus & Sanguis Chriſti, quæ fidelium ore in Eccleſia percipiuntur, Figuræ ſunt, ſecundum Speciem viſibilem. At vero ſecundum inviſibilem ſubſtantiam, Corpus & Sanguis Chriſti vere exiſtunt.

was changed, and the outward appearance only remained, he could not conceive how his Adverſaries (who, *though they faithfully believed* with *Bertram* and the Church, *that the Bread was changed into the true Body of Chriſt,* yet they deny'd there was any Figure in the Sacrament) could reconcile Faith with their Opinion. And this was his Reaſon; *For if the Bread and Wine were another thing than they were before Conſecration, they were changed.* And if the Subſtance was changed, the viſible ſpecies which remained muſt be a Figure.

Quo credunt deſtruere comprobantur, Corpus etenim, Sanguinémque fideliter confitentur, & cum hoc faciunt, non hoc jam eſſe quod prius fuere procul dubio poteſtantur, & ſi aliud ſunt quàm fuere mutationem accêpere.

Rabanus ſpeaking of the Second Propoſition, *viz. Whether the Bread, which was changed into the Body of Chriſt, was the Natural Body of Chriſt,* declares, that it was not the Body of Chriſt received from the Virgin *Mary* in its natural exiſtence, but that it was the true Body which he received from the Virgin after a Supernatural and Sacramental Permanency.

Ep. ad Heribald. c. 33.

The firſt Opinion which he rejects, he charges with Novelty, in the paſſage you cite, Saying, *Some of late not having a right Opinion, concerning the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Lord, have ſaid, that this is the Body and Blood of our Lord which was born of the Virgin* Mary, *and in which our Lord ſuffered upon the Croſs, and roſe from the Dead: which Error we have oppoſed with all our might.*

The other, which was the belief of the Church, he thus delivers: *God effected whatever he would in Heaven and on Earth.* From hence he deduces, that Bread is chang'd into the Body of Chriſt; and therefore adds, *it is no other Fleſh, no other truly than what was born of the Virgin* Mary, *and ſuffered upon the Croſs, and roſe from the Sepulcher. And who does not believe this, if he had ſeen Chriſt upon the Croſs in the likeneſs of a Servant, how would he have underſtood he was God, unleſs Faith had prevailed with him to believe?* And in the 42 Chapter of the ſame Book, he ſpeaks thus; *It is the ſame Fleſh, which was given for thee and for all, and hanged upon the Croſs, becauſe truth teſtifies, This is my Body which ſhall be given for you; and of the Chalice, This is my Blood, which ſhall be ſpilt for you, for remiſſion of Sins.*

De Sanguine Domini, cap. 3. *Non alia Caro eſt, non alia plane, quam quæ nata eſt de Maria, & paſſa in cruce & reſurrexit de Sepulchro.*

Et cap. 3. *At vero quiſquis iſta non credit, Si vidiſſet Chriſtum in Cruce in ſpecie ſervi, quomodo Deum illum intelligeret, niſi per fidem prius credidiſſet?*

Cap. 42. *Neque aliam Carnem quam quæ pro te, & pro omnibus tradita eſt, pependit in Cruce, quia ſic veritas teſtatur, hoc eſt Corpus meum, quod pro vobis tradetur, & de Calice, hic enim Sanguis meus eſt, qui pro vobis effundetur in remiſſionem peccatorum.*

From

From hence it is plain, that what is now the very Doctrin of the Church of *Rome* concerning the Sacrament, the two Learned Authors you have alledged, *Bertram* and *Rabanus*, never oppos'd.

But you tell us, though for a more clear and satisfactory Answer to the pretended Demonstration of Mr. *Arnauld, you have consented to untie the knot, yet you could without all these pains have cut it.* If you strive to cut it with no more skill than you have endeavor'd to untie it, the work must be the labor of some Nobler Champion. 'Tis true, you make use of (in hopes to do the business) *Diogenes* plain stroke of experience o'recoming *Zeno*'s denial of Motion, by walking before his Eyes. Is then the Doctrin of Transubstantiation not the belief of the Primitive Church, *because* Diogenes *walked before* Zeno's *Eyes*? A wilder Proceeding I never heard of from any Christian Divine; and the bare relation of this matter of Fact, is a full confutation thereof.

From the Pagan Philosophers, you run for assistance to the Servants in the Parable, who could not give any punctual account when the Tares were sown, or by whom: Yet it was manifest they were mingled with the good Wheat. From hence you hasten to the Civil Wars of our Nation, where at length our King his Gracious Majesty, *Charles the Second* of Great *Brittain*, was happily restored to his Crown, without a great deal of fighting and Bloodshed. From this place you take your journy into *Turky*, and bring down the Grand Visier (invading Christendom, and besiegeing *Vienna*) who was not opposed by the Most Christian King, who had the greatest Army in Christendom in a readiness.

Whilst I ruminate these Similitudes, I cannot easily conceive, how you can joyn our Great Monarch's happy Restauration, in a Simily with Tares, where Wheat was sown, and with the Grand Seigneur invading Christendom, and not give occasion to the Reader to think you either wanted circumspection in the choice of your Arguments, or imprudently left a suspicion of your Loyalty.

And I wonder how a man of your great Wit and Judgment, could prevail with himself to conclude the Nullity of Mr. *Arnauld*'s solid reasoning from Experiences or matters of Fact, that have nothing at all to do with the Sacrament? Why must

Mr. *Ar-*

Mr. *Arnauld*'s Demonſtration be weak and inſufficient, becauſe the Chriſtian King, not long ſince repoſed in peace, with his great Army; or ſome time ago our Gracious Monarch of happy memory, was reſtored to his Crown; or becauſe St. *Mathew* wrote the Parable of the Tares? All the Reaſon in the World is too weak to make good any ſuch way of proceeding. But to anſwer preciſely to what you affimilate them in, (*viz.* from theſe Compariſons you would prove, that the Controverted Doctrin *might ſilently have come in, and without oppoſition, although the particular time and occaſion of its firſt riſe, could not be aſſigned*;) Did not a conſiderable part of Chriſtendom with all their might oppoſe the Turkiſh Invaſion? and if all had been quiet, would not *Vienna* have been ſurpriſed and pilledged? Was all *England* ignorant of the Reſtauration of our Gracious Monarch; and were there none to be found to witneſs his coming in? were not the Tares, as ſoon as they ſprung up, ſeen and diſcovered? But no body, except Heretics, ever oppoſed Tranſubſtantiation; No body but Rebels roſe againſt the right Prerogative of their Prince.

And what has the Parable of the Tares to do with the Bleſſed Sacrament? The ſame confidence is ſufficient to extend the ſame Compariſon to the reſt of our Chriſtian Myſteries, and proves juſt as much, that is, nothing at all, except Chriſtianity be nothing elſe but Tares.

SECT. III.

Of the Infallible Authority of the Preſent Church for this Doctrin.

YOU ſay, the Roman Church made and obtruded upon the World this Article, merely by vertue of her Authority, *Seeing not any ſufficient reaſon, either from Scripture, or Tradition, for the belief of it.*

The Roman Catholic Church never taught any of her Children, that She had Power from God to make an Article of Faith. But She teaches us, that two Conditions are required for the conſtitution of an Article of Faith. Firſt, Revelation from God. Secondly, The Declaration of an Oecumenical Council. Where theſe two agree, that we are taught, is part of our Belief.

And

And I ſhall deſire you will only peruſe theſe words of the Council of *Trent*, which intimate the Reaſon, why the Church of God declared for Tranſubſtantiation; and I am perſuaded you'l believe She did not define this Doctrin, neither warranted with Scripture, nor Tradition. For the Council ſays; *Becauſe Chriſt our Saviour truly ſaid, that was his Body, which under the Species of Bread, he offered; therefore the Church of God was always perſuaded, and this Holy Council declares again the ſame, that by the conſecration of Bread and Wine, the whole ſubſtance of Bread is changed into the ſubſtance of the Body of our Lord, and the whole ſubſtance of the Wine into the ſubſtance of the Blood, which Converſion is conveniently and properly called by the Council, Tranſubſtantiation.*

Concil. Trid. Seſſ. 13. cap. 4. *Quoniam autem Chriſtus Redemptor noſter, Corpus ſuum id quod ſub ſpecie Panis offerebat, vere eſſe dixit, ideo perſuaſum ſemper in Eccleſia Dei fuit, idque nunc denuo Sancta hæc Synodus declarat per conſecrationem Panis & Vini converſionem fieri totius ſubſtantiæ Panis in ſubſtantiam Chriſti Domini noſtri, & totius ſubſtantiæ Vini in ſubſtantiam Sanguinis ejus, quæ converſio convenienter & proprie à Sancta Catholica Eccleſia Tranſubſtantiatio appellata eſt.*

SECT. IV.

Of the Neceſſity of ſuch a Change for the benefit of the Receiver.

THE Spiritual Efficacy of the Sacrament depends upon receiving the thing, which our Lord inſtituted, and a right preparation and diſpoſition of mind, which makes it effectual to thoſe Spiritual Ends, for which it was appointed.

As God might without any Baptiſmal Water, without any viſible Elements, have waſhed away the Stains of Original Sin, and given Spiritual Regeneration: So could he have made the worthy Receivers true Partakers of the Spiritual Comfort and Benefit deſign'd to us in the Lord's Supper, without any ſubſtantial change made in the nature of Bread and Wine.

But as we cannot ſay, the Water in Baptiſm, and Symbols are unprofitable, as things are inſtituted by God, and uſeleſs for the cleanſing of Original Sin: ſo likewiſe ought we not to pretend, that the Fleſh of Chriſt is uſeleſs, and profiteth nothing to the worthy Receiver of the Sacrament, becauſe Chriſt without this may give us the benefit or fruit of the Sacrament.

God

God might have pardon'd the World, if his only begotten Son had not undergon ſo many griefs and anguiſhes, ſo much pain, and that ignominious death of the Croſs. Yet who dare ſay this Fleſh was not true Fleſh, or profited nothing, which Redeemed all the World? If it profited on the Croſs, why does it not profit in the Sacrament? And if it profit not without Faith, how can it profit thoſe who believe not?

The very thought of our Saviour's Subſtantial Preſence in the Sacrament, ſtrikes much a deeper impreſſion of Devotion in my Soul, than if I reflected on bare Symbols or Signs weakly exciting Faith in me.

And even when a Terrene Prince viſits Priſons, or in a Solemn Pomp enters the Capital City, his Corporal Preſence cuſtomarily frees many Criminals from Chains, Fetters, and Impriſonments, which the Law would otherwiſe not have granted, nor the King conſented too: And yet one word of command is ſufficient to do greater execution.

SECT. V.

Of the Power of the Prieſt.

WE acknowledge a Power in the Prieſt, which is not in the People. All were not conſtituted Apoſtles, all were not Doctors. But we do not acknowledge a Power in the Prieſt *to make God*, as you calumniate us: we acknowledge a Power in God to change one Subſtance into another, Bread into his Body. Till you prove this impoſſible, (which is impoſſible to be done;) you'll give us leave to believe God is in the right poſſeſſion of his Omnipotency, and loſes nothing of his Power by your Detraction. And if you count this Miraculous change no Miracle, give it what Title you pleaſe; we will not diſpute the Name, if you contradict not the thing.

And thus I have diſpatched the firſt part of my Anſwer, which was to vindicate the real Grounds and Reaſons of the Church of *Rome*, for this Doctrin.

PART

PART I.

MY Second Part was designed to answer your Objections, which are of so much the less force, because I have already shewn, this Doctrin sufficiently warranted with Divine Authority; and this easily weighs down, and overthrows whatever Probabilities Sense can suggest, or Reason invent. These Probabilities you reduce to these two Heads, First, *The infinite Scandal of this Doctrin, to the Christian Religion.* And Secondly, *The monstrous and insupportable Absurdity of it.*

CHAP. I.

Of the infinite Scandal of this Doctrin to the Christian Religion.

AND this upon four accounts. First, by reason of the Stupidity of this Doctrin. Secondly, The real barbarousness of it. Thirdly, The Bloody consequences of it. Fourthly, The danger of Idolatry.

Article I.

Of the Stupidity of this Doctrin.

Tully the Roman Orator, says, *When we call the Fruits of the Earth* Ceres, *and Wine* Bacchus, *we use but the common Language, but do you think any man so mad, as to believe what he eats, to be God?* I am of *Cicero*'s Opinion. And all reasonable People look upon Poetical Fancies, as Extravagant Reveries. But I hope the Law of Christ, is neither Poetical nor Fabulous. I remember the Poets sing how *Minerva* the Goddess of Wisdom was born of *Jupiter*'s *Understanding.* Harken, says *Tertullian*, a Fable, but a true one, like to this. *The Word of God proceeding from the Thought of his Eternal Father.* This Likeness, or Similitude of Poetical invention, diminishes not in the least, the truth of the Son's Divinity. Nor ought the Stupidity of eating God, in *Tully*'s Opinion, ridicule our Saviour's own Words, *Take, eat, this is my Body.*

De Natura Provid. lib. 3. *Ecquem tam amentem esse putas, qui illud quo vescatur, Deum credat esse?*

Dionyſ. Carth. in 4. d. 10. a. 1.

Averröes the Arabian Philoſopher, acknowledging in his time this Doctrin, to be the Profeſſion of *all Chriſtians*, ought to make (not what you ſay, the Church of *Rome*) the Church of *England* bluſh, objecting that the *whole Society* of Chriſtians then, every where admitted Tranſubſtantiation. *I have travelled*, ſays he, *over the World, and have found divers Sects, but ſo ſottiſh a Sect or Law I never found, as is the Sect of Chriſtians, becauſe with their own Teeth they devour God, whom they worſhip.*

It was great ſtupidity in the People of *Iſrael*, to ſay, *Come let us make us Gods*; but it was civilly ſaid of them, *Let us make us Gods that may go before us*, in compariſon of the Church of *England*, who calumniouſly make the Catholics ſay, *let us make a God*, that we *may eat him*; when we only ſay, God has power to change *Bread into his Body*.

But the greateſt Stupidity of all is, that in all Probability you think thoſe common *Jugling Words of Hocus Pocus are nothing elſe but a corruption, of Hoc eſt Corpus, by way of a ridiculous Imitation of the Prieſt of the Church of* Rome. I grant this Imitation is very ridiculous. And you are the firſt *Juggler* with this Divine Myſtery, and with our Saviour's own Words, that ever I read of in my life. But with all the *Legerdemain, and Jugling tricks of Falſehood and Impoſture*, youl never make me believe you, ſooner than I do the Scripture.

Nay, if *Averröes*, *Cicero*, and a whole Progenie of Heathen Philoſophers, were as great Jugglers as your ſelf, and altogether deſign'd to put a Trick upon me, you ſhould never juggle me, by the Grace of God, out of my Faith in Chriſt.

And Laſtly, If I ſhould ask counſil of the Philoſophers (as you do in the concern of the Sacrament) to know the true cauſe of this Univerſe, *Heraclitus* would tell me Atoms produced it; *Pythagoras* would ſend me to the Marriage in Numbers; The *Valentinians* would bring me to the four Principles, which made the Treatiſe of Peace between Verity and Silence, Light and Profoundneſs. But whilſt I let them enquire one of another, what gave being to theſe Atoms? who thought theſe Numbers? whence came this Verity? what is the Origin of this Silence? the Source of this Light? the Prop of this Profoundneſs? I reſt contented in mind, and inſtructed with this Paſſage of *Moſes*; *In the beginning God created Heaven and Earth*: God is the Cauſe of all things. *Cicero* may diſpute with his falſe Gods: And *Averröes* may

may deride Christians: A Jugler may laugh at our Saviour's Institution. These words, *this is my Body*, silences them all, and excites me to say with St. *Austin*, *Dispute You, I will believe.* St. Aug. de v. Apli. c. 7. *Tu disputa, ego credam.*

Article II.

Of the Barbarousness of this Doctrin.

THE eating Man's Flesh, in its proper shape, is no doubt very barbarous. But I think the eating our Saviour's Flesh under the Species of Bread and Wine, appears barbarous neither to Sense, nor to Reason. *Theophilact* asks (in *John* 6.) *Why does it not appear Flesh to us, but Bread?* and Answers, *lest we should have horror to eat it.* And what you call *horrible*, St. *Chrysostom* calls *amiable.* For what more Kind than to give himself?

Theophil. c 6. in John. Πῶς φησὶν, ἄγε μὴ σάρξ φαίνεται ἡμῖν ἀλλ' ἄρτος, δι' ἃ τὸ μὴ ἡμᾶς ἀνδιζεσθαι πρὸς τὸ βρῶσιν.

St Chrys. Hom. 24. in 1. ad Cor. *Quid est hoc horribilius? quid autem amabilius.*

But you cannot imagin the Ancient Christians ever own'd any such Doctrin, *because then we should have heard of it from the Adversaries of our Religion in every Page of their Writings.*

This cannot be expected. For very few Pagans concern'd themselves with the Rites of Christianity: And of these the most Famous complain Christians conceal'd the Doctrins they professed. Hence that Murmur of *Cecilius* in *Minutius Felix*, *Why are the Christians carefull to hide and steal their Worship from Mens eyes, since Honesty is never asham'd to face Light?* And *Celsus* disgusted upon the same account, calls our Religion *a Clandestin or hidden Doctrin.* To which *Origen* occurs. *Tis true, there are some Points among us not communicated to all the World, nor is this peculiar to Christians. The Philosophers observ'd two sorts of Principles, some were public and common to all; others were private, and the Science of particular Disciples. 'Tis therefore in vain* Celsus *undertakes to discover the Secrets of Christians, not knowing in what they consist.* St. *Austin*, and St. *Denys* the Areopagite teach the same. And yet whether the Pagans knew them, or knew them not, you will have them revile our Mysteries in every Page of ther Writings.

Apud Origen. δόγματα κρυπτὰ, l. 1. cont. Celsum.

St. Aug. Tract. 11. in John.

St. Dionys. Hier. l. 3. c. 3.

Nor are you contented with this, for you add, *With what confidence would they have set the Cruelty used by Christians in their Sacrament, against their God Saturn's eating his own Children, but that no such Argument was then objected by the Heathens to the Christians,*

is to a wise Man instead of a thousand Demonstrations, that no such Doctrin was believed.

Now sure I am nonplust. For how can I solve an Objection which stands instead of a thousand Demonstrations? What Author will happily fall into my hand, or dictate how our Adversaries gathered from Slaves and Captives a rude Relation of this Mystery, which was matter enough for them to hit us in the Teeth, in requital of *Saturn*'s eating his Children, with the killing and feasting on Flesh and Blood?

Tertull. Apol. c. 7. *Dicimur Infanticidæ & Pabulo crudi--*

This Passage perchance of *Tertullian* may suffice any sober Understanding, that the Pagans did not omit such a return you seek after; *We are* (says he) *called wicked Infanticides,* (Child killers) *and nourished with raw Flesh.*

Athanagoras comes nearer, and reminds us how the Pagans with confidence set the cruelty used by Christians, in their Sacrament, if not against the *God Saturn*'s, at least against *Thyestes*'s (another like History) eating his *own Child. We are impeach'd,* says he, (by Pagans) *of Three horrible Crimes, of taking away the Gods, of* Thyestean *Banquets* (eating of *a Child,*) *and of Incests.*

Anathag. in Apol. Τρία ἐπιφημίζοισιν ἡμῖν ἐγκλήματα, ἀθεότητα, θυέστεια δεῖπνα, οἰδιποδείοις μίξεις.

St. *Justin Martyr* fits you with *Saturn*'s own Fable. *'Tis reported* (says he to the Pagans) *we practice Saturn's Mystery; and killing Man, exercise, with hands full of goar, all the cruel and bloody Rites of your Idolatry.* Now sure I may conclude with you, that because such a thing was then objected by the Heathens to the Christians, it is to a wise Man instead of a thousand Demonstrations, that the Doctrin of Transubstantiation was believed in Primitive Ages, and then modestly vindicated from these foul Aspersions.

St Justin Apol. 1. in fine. Φάσκοντες κρόνου μὲν μυστήρια τελεῖν ἐν τῷ ἀνδροφονεῖν καὶ ἐν τῷ αἵματος ἐμπιπλασθαι ὥς λεγεται τα ἴσα τῷ παρ ἡμιν τιμωμένω εἰδώλω.

Article III.

Of the Bloody Consequences of this Doctrin.

IF this Doctrin had been the occasion of the most Barbarous and Bloody Tragedies, to use your words, that ever were acted in the World, the Enemies of Christianity would have hit them in the Teeth with these Cruelties of terrour, fury and rage; and what endless Triumphs would they have made upon this

this Subject? But that no ſuch thing was objected by the Heathens, is to a wiſe Man inſtead of a thouſand Demonſtrations. And what you want here of Authority, you ſupply and make up in a zealous appearance of Devotion, breaking into this Exclamation; *O Bleſſed Saviour! who can imagine that ever Men ſhould kill one another, for not being able to believe contrary to their Senſes; for being unwilling to think that thou ſhouldſt make one of the moſt barbarous things that can be imagined, a Principle of thy Religion; for not flattering the Preſumption of the Prieſt, who ſays he can make God.*

This is certainly to run headlong into Hell in Heavens Road, wheedling the People into Blind Extaſies, with Hypocritically crying out, *O Bleſſed Saviour!* But all who ſays, *O Lord, O Lord, ſhall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.* Examine your own Prayer, and Reaſon will find matter enough to diſcuſs, and Conſcience more to correct. *Non omnis qui dicit Domine, Domine, intrabit in Regnum Cælorum.*

What Catholic ever ſaid, Firſt, That Men ſhould kill one another; Secondly, That the moſt barbarous thing in the World is a Myſtery of Religion; Thirdly, That we flatter the Prieſt, who ſays, he can make God?

Theſe are as true, as your Prayer is without Calumny or Hypocriſie. They are as true, as there were Execrable Murders committed to drive People into this Senſeleſs Doctrin, by no Body, in no Place.

But they are not as true as the Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation was delivered by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, taught by the Conſent of the Fathers, Divinely revealed and propagated to Poſterity; and ſo free from Stupidity, quiet from Cruelty, and a Pious Myſtery of our Religion.

Article IV.

Of the Danger of Idolatry.

IF we ſhould be miſtaken, as you ſuppoſe, about this Change through the croſsneſs of the Prieſt (which God forbid it ſhould happen) not pronouncing the words of Bleſſing or Conſecration, we ſhould not at all be guilty of Idolatry. For believing only one true God, we profeſs there is infinite Diſtance between him and all Creatures: and therefore we cannot ſo honour any Creature, as we do the true God. Nor is our Intention ever determined

determined by the Will to adore any thing which is not God; So that if the Hoaſt were not, through miſtake, conſecrated by the Prieſt, the Peoples Adoration would be terminated in Chriſt, where e're he is, becauſe it is directed to God, and not to a Creature. The Pagans, 'tis true, or Perſians cannot be excuſed from Idolatry, in worſhiping the Sun, becauſe erring from the knowledge of the true God, they direct their Adoration to what is not God, but a Creature.

Thorndyk's *Preſent State of Religion*, c. 1. p. 7.

Mr. *Thorndyke*, one of the great Lights of your Church, was ſo convinced in this point, that he profeſſes, *ſhould this Church* (*of* England) *declare that the Change, which we call Reformation, is grounded upon this Suppoſition* (*of Idolatry in the Church of* Rome,) *I muſt then acknowledge that we* (Proteſtants) *are the Schiſmatics.*

CHAP. II.

Of the Monſtrous Abſurdity of this Doctrin.

TO ſhew the Abſurdity of this Doctrin, you are contented to ask theſe few Queſtions.

Queſtion 1. *Whether ever any Man have, or ever had greater evidence of the truth of any Divine Revelation, than every Man hath of the Falſehood of Tranſubſtantiation.*

Anſwer. If we had no ſurer Evidence of Revealed Truth, than every Man hath of the Falſehood of Tranſubſtantiation, we ſhould have no true Evidence for Chriſtian Religion; And thus by your Firſt Queſtion Chriſtianity would immediatly be diſpatched out of the World.

Queſt. 2. Suppoſing the Doctrin had been delivered in Scripture in the ſame words, which we read in the Council of *Trent*, You ask, *by what ſtronger Argument could any Man prove to me, that ſuch words were in the Bible, than I can prove to him, that Bread and Wine after Conſecration are Bread and Wine ſtill?*

Anſwer. The Senſe of the Council of *Trent*, and that of the Scriptures are one and the ſame. If therefore I can but appeal to my Eyes to prove ſuch words to be in the Bible, as you do appeal to your Senſes to prove that Bread and Wine remain after Conſecration; what the Scripture ſays, is evidently true according to the Teſtimony of Senſe; and your Teſtimony from Senſe of the ſubſtance of Bread remaining, is evidently falſe. I

have

have great assurance of this. For St. *Paul* forbids me to believe an Angel, if he should come down from Heaven, and teach me contrary to what is writ in Scripture. As *this is* the substance of Bread, and not *my Body*, is contradictory to, *this is my Body*. And what Prerogative enjoy you beyond that of an Angel? And if you draw one way with your Evidence of Sense, and Scriptural Evidence from Sense draw another way, is it not evident that your evidence is good for nothing?

Quest. 3. Whether it be reasonable to imagin, that God should make that a part of Christian Religion, *which shakes the main external Evidence and Confirmation of the whole?* You mean the Miracles which were wrought by our Saviour and his Apostles, *the Assurance whereof did at first depend upon the certainty of Sense?*

Answer. With great Reason and Justice you appeal to the Senses of those, who say, they saw the Miracles which were wrought by our Saviour, and his Apostles; because their Eyes were the proper Witnesses of Miracles: So with the same Reason and Justice I appeal to my Senses to prove, that the words which teach the Doctrin of Transubstantiation are in Scripture, because Paper, Ink, Syllables, and words, are the proper Objects of Seeing, feeling, and hearing. How then does the Catholic Tenet shake the main External Evidence of the Christian Religion, when this external proof of Sense evidences, from Scripture, Transubstantiation?

Quest. *Whether our Saviour's Argument were concluſive or not*, proving to his Disciples after his Resurrection, that his Body was risen, *Luke* 24. 29. *Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I my self, for a Spirit hath not Flesh and Bones, as you see me have.*

And if seeing and handling be an unquestionable Evidence that things are what they appear to our Senses, then the Bread in the Sacrament is not chang'd into the Body of Christ.

Answer. Sense, in its own Objects, is frequently certain; and here we may rely on it. According to this Principle, the Argument which our Saviour used, did certainly prove to the Disciples, that what they saw and handled, was his true Body. For affirmation of Flesh and Bones rightly follows from feeling and seeing. These Actions belong properly to the experience of Sense. Besides, we have all this recorded in Scripture. And our Saviour made use of all other Arguments imaginable to confirm the Mystery of his Resurrection. In

In ſome Circumſtances the Senſes may deceive us, and then we ought not to rely on them. Thus the Jews, deſigning to precipitate our Saviour from the top of a Mountain; *Jeſus*, as we read in Scripture, *paſſed through the crowd, and departed*, and the whole Multitude, truſting to that Information which Senſe gave them, believ'd he was a Ghoſt, or Apparition. In like manner, the ſame true Body of Chriſt is ſubſtantially preſent in the Sacrament after a Spiritual Exiſtence; and therefore it is not the proper Object of Senſe; and ſo we cannot here rely on our Senſes. We muſt then truſt to ſomething elſe, *viz.* to the Teſtimony of Scripture, which is the Rule of Faith, to know ſurely what Subſtance or Body lies under the Species, or appearance of Bread.

Luke 4.

Now the Scripture teaches us, that the Bread in the Euchariſt is the Body of Chriſt, *This is my Body*; and, *the Bread which I will give is my Fleſh.* If it be the Fleſh of Chriſt, as we learn from Scripture, then the Subſtance of Bread remains not; for the remaining Subſtance, at the ſame time, cannot be the Subſtance of Bread, and the Subſtance of the Body of Chriſt. Moreover, our Saviour left many other Teſtimonies in confirmation of this Verity. Our Belief is grounded on our Saviour's Words; and what more ſecure than to build on this Immovable Rock of Truth.

Matth. 26. John 6.

Now what ſhall I ſay, but that your whole Diſcourſe has been levell'd at our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, and his Teſtimonies, againſt which the Gates of Hell ſhall never prevail.

And I finiſh with theſe words of St. *Auſtin. When the Opinion of Error has poſſeſſed Man's Mind, whatever Scripture ſhall ſay in oppoſition to his Senſes, he ſuppoſes a Figurative Interpretation.* Oh that this Figurative receiving Chriſt in the Sacrament, preſage not a Figurative embracing of the ſame in the next World! and ſo you clipping the Shadow for the true Body, loſe for ever Eternal Happineſs.

St. Aug. l. 3. de Doct. Chriſt. c. 13. *Si animum præoccupaverit alicujus erroris opinio, quidquid aliter aſſeruerit Scriptura figuratum homines arbitrantur.*

Eccleſiæ Judicio Subjecta ſunto.

FINIS.